La Revolución Bolivariana es más grande que Maduro: Los venezolanos listos para defender su país

¿Está Estados Unidos orquestando protestas en México para allanar el camino a la guerra contra Venezuela?

STRUGGLE ★ LA LUCHA
for Socialism | por el Socialismo

Struggle-La-Lucha.org
Vol. 8, No. 22 • Dec. 1, 2025
Suggested donation: $1
Struggle for Socialism Party
Partido de la Lucha por el Socialismo

Chicago, Nov. 11: Military veterans protest U.S. bombing of fishing boats off Venezuela.
Photo: The Final Call

Hands off Venezuela!
Venezuelans ready to defend their country
Revolutionary legacy Afro-Venezuelans
Black solidarity with Venezuela

War on Venezuela looms as opposition grows

By Gary Wilson

Nov. 22 – The Trump administration is preparing to launch a new phase of operations against Venezuela within days, according to four U.S. officials who spoke to Reuters on Nov. 22. The escalation comes despite polling showing overwhelming public opposition to military intervention and growing international condemnation of U.S. actions in the region.

Reuters reports that covert operations are expected to be the first component of the new phase, with options under consideration including attempts to overthrow the government of Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro.

The escalation builds on months of military buildup in the Caribbean. The Navy's largest aircraft carrier, the USS Gerald R. Ford, arrived in the region on Nov. 16 with its strike group, joining at least seven other warships, a nuclear submarine, and F-35 aircraft. Since September, U.S. forces have carried out at least 21 strikes on alleged drug boats, killing at least 83 people, mostly in the Caribbean.

The New York Times reported in October that Trump signed a classified "presidential finding" authorizing the CIA to conduct covert operations in Venezuela. According to the Times, these operations could include sabotage, cyberattacks, psychological operations, or other actions intended to "prepare the battlefield" for further military action.

On Monday, the administration plans to designate the

Continued on page 5

Chicago Mayor calls for a general strike
New Orleans elects former prisoner
Charlotte, N.C.: "No one is illegal"
Baltimore library union saves jobs
A presidency above the law
Who decides what we see?
Bitcoin is speculation

Eyewitness: Cuban socialism
Can't build a revolution on Instagram
Staging war via Mexico
Japan & U.S. move toward confrontation over Taiwan

Palestinians reject U.S.–backed U.N. plan
What the U.N. Gaza vote revealed
How ILWU Local 10 led the battle against South African apartheid

Chicago Mayor Brandon Johnson calls

By Sharon Black

Chicago's Mayor Brandon Johnson, in a fiery speech to a quarter million people at the recent "No Kings Protest" that went viral, declared:

> "If my ancestors, as slaves, can lead the greatest general strike in the history of this country, taking it to the ultra-rich and big corporations, we can do the same thing. I'm calling on Black people, white people, Brown people, Asian people, immigrants, gay people throughout this country to stand up against tyranny. To send a clear message, we are going to make them pay their fair share in taxes, to fund our schools, our jobs, health care and transportation!"

Brandon Johnson speaks to a massive crowd of a quarter million at Chicago's "No Kings Protest."

What did Johnson mean by 'the greatest general strike'?

Johnson was referencing the "General Strike" of enslaved Black people during the Civil War, described by scholar and activist W.E.B. Du Bois in his book "Black Reconstruction in America, 1860–1880."

This seminal work shatters the myth that freedom was given, documenting the pivotal role that Black people played in fighting chattel slavery. Du Bois explains this in the most class conscious manner.

Chapter 4, entitled "The General Strike," opens with:

> "How the Civil War meant emancipation and how the Black worker won the war by a general strike which transferred his labor from the Confederate planter to the Northern invader, in whose army lines workers began to be organized as a new labor force."

Du Bois correctly reframed the mass exodus of enslaved people from Southern plantations during the Civil War not as a passive by-product of the war, but as a "General Strike."

How enslaved Black workers crippled the Confederate economy

By withdrawing their labor – the primary source of the South's wealth – Black people disrupted agricultural production, leading to food shortages; undermined the logistics and infrastructure supporting Confederate armies; and forced the Confederacy to divert troops from the front lines to guard against insurrection and capture runaways.

This "strike" forced the hand of the U.S. government. Initially, Lincoln's goal was to preserve the Union, not to abolish slavery. However, the flood of "contrabands" (escaped enslaved people) to Union camps created a practical and moral crisis. It became clear that the war could not be won without addressing the source of the South's power: slavery.

Thus, the "General Strike" was a primary catalyst for the Emancipation Proclamation and the shift to a war for freedom.

As Du Bois wrote, the half-million enslaved people who walked away from plantations were the most effective "army" operating behind Confederate lines, whose actions were as militarily significant as any battlefield engagement.

Why this history matters now

It shows that a "general strike" in its many forms can act as a catalyst for historic change. It demonstrates that workers' action does not always have to be directed solely by what's considered the formal labor movement – though unions remain essential and powerful.

In a period of declining union membership, this history underscores the need to organize the working class broadly, across industries, identities, and geographies.

May Day 2006 'A Day Without Immigrants'

The catalyst for the 2006 movement was H.R. 4437, the Sensenbrenner Bill, which would have criminalized undocumented immigrants – and anyone who assisted them. This draconian measure ignited a firestorm within immigrant communities, transforming long-simmering frustration into mass action.

Organizers urged supporters to abstain from working, buying, selling and attending school. Farms, construction sites, and factories across the Midwest and South fell silent. Meatpacking plants in the Great Plains were forced to shut down.

Workers at Tyson Foods and Cargill walked off the job. Restaurants in major cities closed their doors. The Port of Los Angeles, the nation's busiest, slowed to a crawl as truck drivers joined the boycott.

A nationwide mobilization of millions

On May 1, 2006, the nationwide "Day Without Immigrants" boycott and march drew 1.6 to 2.2 million participants. In cities like Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York, the air was filled with chants of "¡Sí, Se Puede!" and the sound of Spanish-language radio stations, which had been instrumental in organizing the masses.

In Chicago, estimates of protesters ranged from 400,000 to 700,000. Walkouts and protests occurred across the country,

Continued on page 3

Struggle-La Lucha

Subscribe and/or donate

www.struggle-la-lucha.org
facebook.com/strugglelalucha
twitter.com/StruggleLaLucha
info@struggle-la-lucha.com

CONTACT STRUGGLE-LA LUCHA

ATLANTA
Atlanta@struggle-la-lucha.org

BALTIMORE
Baltimore@struggle-la-lucha.org

BOONVILLE, INDIANA
Boonville@struggle-la-lucha.org

BOSTON
Boston@struggle-la-lucha.org

DENVER
Denver@struggle-la-lucha.org

DETROIT
Detroit@struggle-la-lucha.org

LOS ANGELES
LA@struggle-la-lucha.org

NEW ORLEANS
NOLA@struggle-la-lucha.org

NEW YORK CITY
NYC@struggle-la-lucha.org

ORLANDO, FLORIDA
Orlando@struggle-la-lucha.org

SAN DIEGO
SanDiego@struggle-la-lucha.org

WASHINGTON, D.C.
DC@struggle-la-lucha.org

for a general strike

Here's why it matters

Continued from page 2

including Milwaukee, Phoenix, and Denver.

May Day 2006 was a moment when an often-invisible workforce made itself seen, an often-silenced community made itself heard – and for one day, the United States was forced to confront a simple, powerful truth: The nation runs on the labor of immigrants. This seismic event shook the nation's political and economic landscape.

Ultimately, H.R. 4437 died in the Senate.

Is Johnson's call for a general strike realistic?

The evidence suggests yes. In an interview with Block Club Chicago, Johnson clarified that he was calling for a nationwide strike as a political goal, urging workers and communities to organize toward that possibility.

Ald. Byron Sigcho-Lopez (25th) said he and other progressives fully support Johnson's call and are exploring how the city can legally support such an effort. This includes meeting with local labor leaders and compiling a list of small businesses to support and large corporations to boycott.

The mayor's goal, according to Sigcho-Lopez, is to "inspire conversations" among organizers and working people. Both officials have endorsed the plan by the United Auto Workers (UAW) to hold a general strike on May Day 2028.

Signs of action sooner than 2028

Some unions are preparing for action well before 2028. Chicago Teachers Union Vice President Jackson Potter stated that the CTU is preparing for escalating actions and "strike action – probably much sooner than 2028."

> "We're working towards building a more spectacular, broader, and stronger version of the UAW's call for a General Strike in 2028," Potter said. "We aim to align our contracts to make demands that benefit all working families – national health care, free college for all, and other essential needs that many are struggling to achieve."

Other national labor voices have echoed similar calls, including Sara Nelson, international president of the Association of Flight Attendants-CWA, AFL–CIO, and Richard Hooker Jr., a Philadelphia Teamster leader preparing to challenge the reactionary Teamster president, Sean O'Brien.

Chicago's legacy of struggle

May Day had its origins in Chicago. Two days after tens of thousands of workers marched for the eight-hour day on May 1, 1886, police and company guards opened fire on the McCormick Harvester strikers in Chicago, killing as many as six.

In the 1800s, workers toiled for 10, 12 or more hours a day. The Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions (a precursor to the AFL) called for a national movement for an eight-hour day, to take effect on May 1, 1886.

At a massive protest rally at Haymarket Square the next evening, a provocateur's bomb killed several police, leading to the frame-up of eight anarchists, most of whom were not even at Haymarket Square that evening. Four of them were hanged. This familiar history is recited at annual May Day celebrations everywhere.

In 1889, the Second International declared May 1 as International Workers' Day to commemorate the "Haymarket Martyrs" and the struggle for the eight-hour day. Around the world, May Day is celebrated as a day for worker solidarity and protest.

The 2012 Chicago Teachers' Strike

In September 2012, the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU), representing nearly 30,000 educators, went on strike for seven days. It was the first major teacher strike in Chicago in 25 years and became a national flashpoint in the debate over public education.

The strike was notable for its strong, militant parent and community support and is widely seen as a victory for the union. It preserved key job-security provisions, limited the impact of test scores on evaluations, and provided a pay raise.

The success of the 2012 strike and the iconic "Red Wave" cemented the influence of a more progressive, social-justice-oriented caucus within the CTU and established a model of militant unionism that has shaped labor actions across the country ever since.

It helped advance a new approach where unions make demands that benefit not just members but entire communities. This legacy is directly connected to today's CTU leadership – and to their close alignment with figures like Mayor Brandon Johnson, a former CTU organizer. #

Charlotte students lead mass revolt against Trump's immigration raids

By Gary Wilson

As federal agents swept through Charlotte, North Carolina, the first and most powerful pushback came from the students – the young people who showed what solidarity looks like in action.

On Nov. 17, more than 30,000 Charlotte-Mecklenburg students stayed home in a coordinated "sickout" to protest a federal operation targeting immigrant neighborhoods. By the end of the week, more than 56,000 students had refused to attend school, making it one of the largest student-led actions against immigration raids anywhere in the country.

Their walkout was sparked by "Charlotte's Web," a large, militarized operation launched by the Trump administration in mid-November. Led by Customs and Border Protection Commander Gregory Bovino, federal agents in masks and unmarked vehicles carried out warrantless traffic stops, stormed homes, and pulled drivers over at gunpoint. Nearly 400 people were arrested across Charlotte and surrounding towns in the first week alone.

The violence of the raids was unmistakable – and so was the response. Students at East Mecklenburg High School, Philip O. Berry Academy, Ballantyne Ridge High School, Northwest School of the Arts, and many others walked out with handmade signs defending their classmates and families.

Across the city, parents, workers, and neighbors built rapid-response networks to track federal agents in real time. When CBP tried to seize day laborers outside a Home Depot, more than 100 residents showed up, surrounding the agents and forcing them to retreat. Hundreds later marched through the streets carrying signs reading "Human rights have no borders" and "No human being is illegal." #

Protesters outside a closed Latine-owned bakery in Charlotte on Nov. 18 denounce the Trump's Operation "Charlotte's Web," which has forced businesses to shut down in fear of federal raids.

A presidency above the law – and the struggle ahead

By Gary Wilson

The United States is living through a profound political shift. A new, executive-centered form of rule is taking shape – a strongman presidency that claims the right to act without oversight, constraint, or accountability.

Trump's current administration is moving faster and more aggressively than before. In under a year, he has concentrated enormous power in the executive branch, pulling decision-making on trade, immigration, federal spending, and even the mechanics of elections directly into his office. Government functions that once depended on congressional authority are being folded into the presidency itself.

This is not just a policy shift. It's a restructuring of the state.

Governing by decree

A defining feature of the new authoritarianism is the White House's rapid takeover of powers traditionally held by Congress. Trump's current administration isn't just using executive power more aggressively – it is using it as the primary way it governs.

The current administration's use of executive power has been extensive and unprecedented in the post–World War II era. President Trump has issued 212 executive orders in the first 10 months of 2025, nearly matching the 220 he issued during his entire first term. These decrees have been used to tighten control over a vast range of policy areas that constitutionally belong to the legislative branch, including international trade, federal spending, immigration enforcement, and the imposition of tariffs. One of the most significant of these actions is Executive Order 14248, signed on March 25, 2025, and titled "Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections," which directs a sweeping overhaul of federal election procedures and places broad authority over voting access, oversight, and certification directly under the executive branch.

This isn't a bureaucratic reshuffling – it's the consolidation of state power into a single office. By pulling decision-making on core economic, immigration, and electoral functions into the presidency, the administration is weakening the role of Congress and reshaping the basic structure of governance. The center of gravity in U.S. politics is shifting toward unilateral rule from the top.

A national police force in all but name

At the same time, federal agencies built for very different purposes are being repurposed and merged into a single domestic apparatus – a national police force in all but name.

An "ICE Out" protest in Des Moines. Across the country, people are resisting the expansion of federal policing and mass deportations.

Constitutionally and politically, the United States has never developed a federal police force with general police powers – policing has been concentrated in the states – and no single federal agency has ever been entrusted with general police authority across the country. The FBI, for example, is a federal investigative agency – not a general police force – and its powers are limited to specific federal crimes.

ICE, the Border Patrol, and the National Guard are being deployed together across multiple states against migrants and protesters. Border Patrol tactical teams now conduct raids deep inside major cities like Chicago and Los Angeles, sometimes using military helicopters and Predator drones. Masked, unidentifiable officers appear in residential neighborhoods. Tear gas is fired into communities. These deployments erase the traditional lines between police, immigration enforcement, and the military. This level of centralized, federal domestic force is new.

And it is being expanded by pulling thousands of personnel from the FBI, DEA, and U.S. Marshals into mass immigration sweeps – a federal police force deployed to fulfill the White House's political priorities.

Reshaping the military for political loyalty

Inside the military, the changes go even deeper. Trump's Secretary of War, Pete Hegseth, has launched a sweeping purge of senior officers – targeting career commanders, especially people of color, women, LGBTQ and trans officers – all under the banner of fighting "wokeness." This isn't about discipline. It's about political loyalty: building an officer corps that answers directly to the executive. The purge has been accompanied by an assault on the military's internal legal system. The administration fired key Judge Advocate General officers – top military lawyers – after calling them "roadblocks," undermining legal checks meant to keep the armed forces within the law.

At the same time, the Pentagon has ordered military academies to end consideration of race and gender, purge libraries of material referencing "white privilege," and reshape training around a reactionary, politicized agenda.

Extremism moves into the state itself

As the administration tightens control at the top, racist and reactionary forces are being absorbed into the lower ranks of law enforcement. Proud Boys and white-supremacist sympathizers have entered ICE, the Border Patrol, and local police departments. Far-right coded symbols appear in DHS and CBP recruitment materials, and officers inside these agencies increasingly align themselves openly with extremist currents.

Events like Charlottesville and Jan. 6 weren't the creation of a mass movement capable of overthrowing the state. They were test runs – identifying recruits and networks now being folded into the state's coercive machinery.

Political violence is being bureaucratized and professionalized under federal command.

Empire in decline, violence on the rise

This authoritarian turn at home is inseparable from the decline of U.S. global imperialism. As the U.S. slides deeper into crisis, the ruling class turns once again to militarism, economic sanctions, and the use of force – the core methods it has long used to defend imperialist power.

For most of the 20th century, the U.S. acted as a classic imperialist power – exporting capital abroad while easily attracting global investment because it was one of the most profitable places to produce. That period has ended. The Trump administration is now pressuring countries like South Korea and Saudi Arabia to pour billions into U.S. factories – like a developing country trying to force industrialization. Instead of capital flowing outward, the U.S. is using threats, tariffs, and military alliances to drag capital inward. It resembles a protection racket more than an empire: "Invest here or face consequences."

This shift is a sign of decline: U.S. manufacturing profits are too low to attract investment on their own, so the ruling class now depends on political coercion – not economic strength – to hold its base together.

Nearly 14% of the entire U.S. Navy is now deployed to the Caribbean under Operation Southern Spear. This extraordinary buildup targets governments that refuse to bow to U.S. imperialist interests – Venezuela, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Colombia.

U.S. forces have carried out lethal strikes on vessels in international waters – killings condemned by UN human rights experts as

Continued on page 5

Continued from page 4

"extrajudicial executions."

This is what imperialist powers do in decline: Repression tightens at home and violence expands abroad.

The political space that still exists

But we need clarity about the moment we're living in. The U.S. is moving into a harsher, more authoritarian form of rule, but it is not fascism – and that distinction matters. It means people still have room to organize, speak out, and take action. And that political space isn't a gift from the system; it exists because working and oppressed people are fighting to keep it open.

Everything that's still possible today – every protest, every walkout, every act of solidarity – survives because people refuse to back down.

If the system had already crossed into fascism, none of this would be possible.

The struggle is unfolding – not over

The United States is entering a new phase of authoritarian rule, driven by the crisis of capitalism and the decline of U.S. imperialist power. But the future is not predetermined. The capitalist state is tightening its grip – but there is still room to organize, resist, and push back.

Our task now is to expand that space – not retreat from it. Intensify the struggle: Stand with Palestine – stand against war – stand with all working and oppressed people. What we do now will shape what comes next. #

Venezuela

Continued from page 1

so-called Cartel de los Soles as a foreign terrorist organization. Trump has claimed this designation will allow the U.S. to strike Venezuelan assets and infrastructure.

Defense Secretary Pete Hegseth stated last week that the terrorist designation "brings a whole bunch of new options." The administration has doubled the reward for information leading to Maduro's arrest to $50 million.

Venezuela is not involved in any way with the global drug trade. Pino Arlacchi, former head of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), says that decades of annual reports on drug trafficking never once mention Venezuela, because it doesn't exist.

Arlacchi calls the Cartel of the Suns an entity as mythical as the Loch Ness Monster. He says that the Cartel de los Soles does not exist – that it is a U.S. intelligence invention used to criminalize Venezuelan officials wholesale and manufacture a pretext for intervention. It's reported that the name is a CIA invention. The suns are a reference to the insignia worn by Venezuelan military personnel on their uniforms.

Pino Arlacchi continues: "Yet Venezuela is systematically demonized, contrary to every

Continued to page 7

Former prisoner elected New Orleans court clerk

By Gregory E. Williams

New Orleanians elected Calvin Duncan to be the clerk of court for the parish (county) in a runoff election on Nov. 15. Duncan – who was exonerated in 2021 after spending 28 years in prison – won with 68.2% of the vote, despite intense attacks from the right wing. He ran on a platform of reforming how court records are stored and accessed so people can actually obtain the documents they need.

Both Duncan and his opponent, incumbent Darren Lombard, are Black, but only Duncan has spoken out against the racist violence of the so-called criminal justice system. He used his campaign to expose how the system fails working-class and oppressed people.

Louisiana and Mississippi are neck and neck in terms of states with the highest incarceration rate, and the U.S. as a whole has one of the highest incarceration rates in the world. In 2025, 34.9% of U.S. prisoners are Black, with 30.7% being Latine. Louisiana has also become a major hub for immigrant detention.

Duncan knows these injustices firsthand. While serving a life sentence, he educated himself to become a jailhouse lawyer, helping many others in prison. He learned exactly how this system is stacked against working-class and oppressed people, and how difficult it is just to get access to documents relating to one's own case.

Obtaining documents is particularly difficult in New Orleans, where the court system still largely relies on paper documents, although that is set to change soon. Many were lost during Hurricane Katrina, and just this past August, the clerk's office had to scramble to retrieve thousands of sensitive documents accidentally dumped in a landfill.

The political establishment's reaction suggested they felt threatened by Duncan's campaign. Incumbent Lombard joined with the racist right wing in calling Duncan a murderer to make voters doubt the legitimacy of his exoneration. Governor Landry's attack dog, Attorney General Liz Murrill, has led the attacks.

Just as the right-wing and Democratic Party establishment failed to turn New York voters against Zohran Mamdani with Islamophobia, Murrill's campaign against Duncan failed. Voters showed that they are more sophisticated than cynical leaders give them credit for. They are more interested in hearing truth about the oppressive systems they actually live with than whatever those leaders are offering.

Calvin Duncan at home in New Orleans. After 28 years wrongfully imprisoned, he now heads the clerk of court's office.

And they are open to a progressive platform.

I spoke with a law student who saw Duncan give a presentation all the way in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, at a Nov. 5 event put on by the Marquette Law School. He said:

"Hearing him speak, it was impossible to ignore the reality that those incarcerated in prisons such as Angola are real human beings whose lives are being stolen from them by this white supremacist system that is perpetuating the legacy of slavery through new means.

"He emphasized that defending the rights of those accused of crimes is an essential foundation enshrined in this country's legal framework, and now that it is, at least prima facie, applicable to everyone, that foundation must be defended vigorously. I believe his perspective is crucial for those who aim to serve the most vulnerable and oppressed in society, as he has been doing so for decades."

Duncan's election is significant because he has sharply raised the problems of racism and police repression at a time when the Trump regime and servile state governments are attempting to stop any discussion of the real history of this country and racist oppression happening right now.

In order to have a just society, we will have to overthrow racist, capitalist institutions. That will take an incredible mass movement. But elections like this one in New Orleans and Mamdani's election in New York are a temperature check for the mood of the masses, and progressive electoral campaigns can sometimes be used to raise awareness and mobilize people for higher-level struggles. As a temperature check, these election results are promising. #

Whose news is it–who decides what we see?

By Lallan Schoenstein

Fidel Castro was one of the great communicators. He focused on the problems of raising the cultural level so that people could gain control of their own destiny.

Castro warned that the great media corporations of the imperialist countries functioned as the heavy artillery of the ideological war – instruments that spread confusion, fear, and demoralization, and that worked to disarm the people politically. He stressed that mass media was the main ideological weapon used by oligarchies to shape consciousness and defend their power.

"When they emerged, the mass media seized minds and ruled them not merely on the basis of lies, but on conditioned reflexes. A lie is not the same as a conditioned reflex. A lie affects knowledge; a conditioned reflex affects the capacity to think. ...They don't teach the masses how to read or write, they spend billions on advertising every year to pull the wool over the eyes of a huge majority of humanity." ("Fidel Talks About Freedom of the Press," 2008)

Fidel Castro said, "Illiterate and semi-literate people cannot do it, and for hundreds of years, while colonialism reigned and the capitalist system was developing since the invention of the printing press, four-fifths of the population could neither read nor write, and there was no free and public education system.

"Today, through huge investments alone one can have centers which broadcast the news throughout the planet and only those who direct them decide what is broadcast and how it is broadcast, what is printed and how it is printed. The efforts made by the Pentagon to monopolize information and the Internet networks are obvious." ("Once Again, the Rotten OAS," 2009)

Trump attacks on the media

Trump is fond of blasting the media with a rant about "Totally fake news." It is clear that he is not talking about the paucity of real news. No, it is understood that he is whining about the appeasement of his bloated ego.

Trump has threatened to sue the British government–affiliated BBC for between $1 billion and $5 billion, claiming that a news clip of Trump's speech before the Jan. 6, 2021, attack on the Capitol was unfairly edited. The controversy led to the resignations of the BBC's Director-General Tim Davie and Head of News Deborah Turness.

Neither Davie nor Turness is known for left-wing bias. Turness even promoted Nigel Farage, the racist, anti-immigrant leader of Reform U.K. Nonetheless, an ultra-right member of the BBC Board, Robbie Gibb, wrote in an August 2020 Daily Telegraph opinion piece:

Fidel Castro and Hugo Chávez read Granma together, underscoring a shared commitment to media that serves the people, not oligarchs.

"The BBC has been culturally captured by the woke-dominated group, think of some of its own staff."

"There is a default left-leaning attitude from a metropolitan workforce mostly drawn from a similar social and economic background."

The media oligarchs

Within the United States, the high-tech media establishment, with its powerful media control, backs Trump's rule. For the most part, they support his aggressive grasp of the U.S. governing state, which parallels their rapidly expanding media presence.

Elon Musk, the richest man on Earth, now owns X, formerly known as Twitter. He bought it for $44 billion in 2022, giving him control of a platform that had previously served as a broad public source for news stories. Musk promised to unleash its "extraordinary potential."

Larry Ellison, the second-richest man, has a son, David, whose company, Skydance Media, merged with Paramount Global in July, making David Ellison CEO of the new Paramount Skydance, which owns CBS. The Ellisons have also made bids to acquire Warner Bros. Discovery, which owns CNN.

In July, Paramount paid $16 million to settle Trump's lawsuit against CBS over a "60 Minutes" interview with Kamala Harris. Two weeks later, on July 17, CBS announced it would cancel The Late Show with Stephen Colbert, with the show ending in May 2026. In August, Brendan Carr, the Trump-appointed chair of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), approved film studio Skydance's $8 billion merger with Paramount on the condition that CBS provide "unbiased coverage" and eliminate what he called "discriminatory" programs that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.

In early October, CBS named the anti-"woke" blogger Bari Weiss editor-in-chief of CBS News. Weiss's only experience in broadcasting was running a right-wing, pro-Zionist newsletter called The Free Press. It was subsequently leaked that CBS News suppressed Trump's boast that the network "paid me a lotta money" in a "60 Minutes" interview.

Ellison is a big Trump donor. In fact, he was one of those on a phone call to plot how Trump's 2020 election defeat could be overturned. In June, Ellison and Oracle were co-sponsors of Trump's military parade in Washington.

Mark Zuckerberg is the third-richest man in the world, with an estimated net worth of $251 billion according to Forbes. He owns Facebook, Instagram and WhatsApp. Zuckerberg changed Facebook's name to Meta to reflect his ambition to dominate the "metaverse," which he says is "the next frontier."

The fourth-richest man, Jeff Bezos, owns The Washington Post and Amazon MGM Studios. The Washington Post Editorial Board recently published a piece applauding the Pentagon's push for a new generation of small nuclear reactors – specifically the Army's Janus Program and Project Pele. This caused controversy because X-energy, a key contender for these military contracts, is now financially linked to Amazon: In October 2024, Amazon announced it was anchoring a $500 million investment in X-energy. Amazon Web Services is partnering with X-energy to deploy small modular reactors (SMRs) to power its data centers, particularly in Washington state and Virginia.

Another multi-billionaire media oligarch, Rupert Murdoch, owns Fox News, The Wall Street Journal, and the New York Post, as well as the book publisher HarperCollins. He and his son own hundreds of local, national, and international publishing outlets around the world, including in Britain (The Sun and The Times), Australia (The Daily Telegraph, Herald Sun, and The Australian), and the television network Sky News Australia – giving them major political influence in Britain, the United States and Australia.

In 2017, Murdoch sold the bulk of his family's 21st Century Fox entertainment businesses to Disney for $66 billion, but kept the newspapers and the right-wing U.S. cable channel Fox News. "Are we retreating? Absolutely not," he said during an investor call on the day the deal was announced. "We are pivoting at a pivotal moment."

The growing menace of misinformation

Fidel Castro spoke about the toxic menace of the capitalist dominance of culture. The support of the media oligarchs for the Trump regime is an ominous sign of the crisis of their decaying class.

At the same time, their attempts to control the consciousness of the masses through the media are becoming less successful. Oppo-

Continued on page 17

Venezuela

Continued from page 5

principle of truth. In his memoir following his resignation, former FBI Director James Comey revealed the unspoken motives behind American policies towards Venezuela. Trump told him that Maduro's government was "sitting on a mountain of oil that we have to buy. This is not about drugs, crime or national security. It is about oil that the U.S. would rather not pay for."

Public rejects regime change narrative

Despite the administration's justifications, the U.S. public remains opposed. Opposition to using military force outweighs support by a significant margin: 45% oppose overthrowing Maduro while only 17% favor doing so. A separate Reuters / Ipsos poll found that 51% of respondents disapproved of the boat strikes that have killed dozens of people, nearly double the 29% who approved.

The strikes on boats are illegal killings of civilians. The top military lawyer for U.S. Southern Command, which oversees operations in the Caribbean, raised concerns in August that the strikes could amount to extrajudicial killings and could legally expose service members involved in the operations. His concerns were overruled. The commander of Southern Command, Admiral Alvin Holsey, resigned in October, reportedly due to concerns about the legality of the boat strikes.

Several U.S. allies have refused to share intelligence for the Caribbean operations due to concerns over their legality. Britain, France, Canada, and the Netherlands have all declined to provide intelligence support. Former U.S. Ambassador Chas Freeman called Britain's decision "quite remarkable," noting it represents "a break with the 80-year long US-UK intelligence cooperation alliance."

MI6 and the British establishment have stated that the attacks are illegal and would subject those who carry them out to prosecution, describing them as war crimes and acts of piracy.

Venezuela prepares defense

The Venezuelan government has responded to U.S. threats by mobilizing military exercises and preparing for what it calls "prolonged resistance" in the event of invasion. This approach would involve small military units at more than 280 locations carrying out sabotage and guerrilla tactics.

President Maduro has stated that Venezuelan citizens and the military will resist any U.S. attempt to oust him, and has characterized U.S. actions as an effort to seize control of Venezuela's oil and other significant resources, including gold, coltan (used in electronics), and other minerals. Venezuela has the largest proven oil reserves in the world.

Maduro has also expressed willingness to resolve differences through diplomacy and hold face-to-face talks.

The Trump administration's escalating aggression against Venezuela represents a dangerous continuation of U.S. imperialist policy in Latin America. The operation is being conducted without public support, without legal justification, and without regard for international law or human rights.

The rationale for war has been exposed as fraudulent. The military buildup far exceeds anything needed for counter-narcotics operations. The boat strikes have killed dozens of people in what amounts to illegal executions. And now the administration is preparing to launch covert operations and potentially a full military intervention against a sovereign nation that poses no threat to the United States.

What is clear is that this has nothing to do with drugs and everything to do with regime change and control of Venezuela's oil and resources. This is how the U.S. empire operates: It does not believe in self-determination and thinks it has the right to intervene in the domestic politics of every country on the planet.

With a new phase of operations set to begin within days, the demand must be clear and unequivocal: Stop the U.S. war on Venezuela. No covert operations. No military strikes. No regime change. Hands off Venezuela. #

Union wins jobs back for Baltimore librarians

Supporters of fired library workers packed the Baltimore County Public Library board meeting on Nov. 19.

SLL photo: Lev Koufax

By Lev Koufax

Fourteen part-time librarians at the Baltimore County Public Library received a jarring email on the afternoon of Nov. 12. BCPL leadership's email informed them that they would no longer have jobs. The mass firing came just ahead of the holiday season and without any advance notice.

All 14 are members of the International Association of Machinists Local 4538, which represents the several hundred BCPL workers and the staff of a nearby Apple Store. Several of those fired were particularly active members of their union. One of the fired librarians is an active union steward and member of the Local's bargaining committee.

Some of the fired librarians worked in the system for more than 30 years, only to be met with an undignified and sudden dismissal. These library workers provide a variety of services to the community beyond books and research. Many serve as de facto social workers, interfacing with large groups of children, the homeless, and people struggling with addiction. Luckily, the workers, their union, and the local community jumped into action.

The outrage at the firings was immediate and passionate. Local 4538 called upon other unions and all concerned community members to flood the media with support. The Machinists' local also urged those same people to pack the Baltimore County Council meeting and a BCPL board meeting.

Simply from the outrage in the press and the public plans to mobilize, the BCPL backpedaled two days later and rehired all 14 part-time librarians. However, the workers still packed the BCPL board meeting on Tuesday, Nov. 19, to make sure this never happens again.

At this meeting, Local 4538 President Anita Bass not only condemned the firing but spoke in favor of broader worker power, stating:

"I don't understand what any of you were thinking. We are a union. We are Machinists. We are here to protect our people. We will not tolerate intimidation, retaliation or union busting. We are also in the middle of negotiating our financial contract. How dare you fire a union member that is on the negotiating committee. Two days later the reinstatement of the part-time librarians was a result of community outcry and union power."

President Bass couldn't be more correct. As Frederick Douglass taught, power concedes nothing without a demand. In the case of the Baltimore County Public Library, the workers mobilized to demand the reinstatement of their fellow library staff. Through struggle and organizing, they won that demand swiftly. Long live worker power! #

Palestinians reject U.S.–backed U.N.

A U.S.-drafted U.N. resolution endorsing President Donald Trump's Gaza "peace plan" passed in the Security Council on Nov. 17.

Palestinians responded: This is not peace – it's a blueprint for foreign control.

At the center of the plan is a new "Board of Peace" – a U.S.- and British-dominated governing body personally chaired by Trump. It would control Gaza's borders, security, reconstruction, and political life. It alone would decide when Palestinians are "ready" to govern themselves. In other words: sovereignty by permission slip.

For Palestinians, this is not a transition. It is a takeover.

A return to colonial rule

The resolution's structure mirrors the old colonial mandates of the 20th century – only now U.S. officials, not British ones, would decide Gaza's future. By separating Gaza from the rest of Palestine and granting Washington and Israel power over any future "withdrawal," the plan locks in occupation under a new administrative costume.

Palestinian organizations across the political spectrum immediately rejected the proposal. Their objections were unified and simple: This violates self-determination, transfers sovereign power to foreign hands, and tries to achieve politically what Israel failed to win through military assault.

'Guardianship' by another name

Hamas called the plan an "international guardianship mechanism" designed to enforce the outcome Israel could not secure through its war: the dismantling of Palestinian resistance and the political fragmentation of the Palestinian nation.

They warned that the proposed International Stabilization Force – ordered to disarm Palestinian fighters – would not be neutral. It would become an arm of the occupation.

The unified Palestinian Resistance issued a joint statement on Nov. 16, warning that the plan opens the door to "external dominance over the national decision-making." They also

Continued on page 9

What the U.N. Gaza vote revealed

By Gary Wilson

Colonial plan in diplomatic clothing

A U.S.-drafted UN resolution endorsing President Donald Trump's Gaza "peace plan" passed in the Security Council on Nov. 17. Palestinians responded immediately: This was not peace – it was a blueprint for foreign control.

Millions worldwide march for Gaza.

At the heart of Washington's scheme is a new "Board of Peace," a U.S.- and British-dominated governing body personally chaired by Trump. This board would control Gaza's borders, security, reconstruction, and political life. It alone would decide when Palestinians are "ready" to govern themselves. Sovereignty becomes a permission slip issued by the same powers that arm, fund, and defend Israel's occupation. For Palestinians, this is not a transition. It is a takeover.

The plan is a modern remake of the colonial mandates, with Washington assuming the power once wielded by the British Empire over Palestine. By severing Gaza from the rest of Palestine and granting Washington and Israel authority over any future "withdrawal," the resolution repackages occupation in the deceptive language of "governance" and "stability."

Imposing through diplomacy what Israel failed to win through war

The resolution is Washington's effort to impose through paperwork what Israel could not achieve through genocide. After months of bombardment failed to crush Palestinian resistance or force Gaza to submit, the plan steps in to finish the job by other means. It aims to deliver, through UN seals and diplomatic signatures, the foreign control that Israel's military could not win. It is an attempt to convert military failure into political domination – occupation by administrative order.

This was the resolution before the Security Council. And in this moment – with Gaza under bombardment, tens of thousands dead or displaced, hospitals destroyed, and entire neighborhoods flattened – the world looked to see whether Russia or China would block it.

Neither did. Both abstained.

Only Russia and China had the actual power to stop the resolution. The other members – including the U.S.-aligned Arab regimes – were never going to block a plan drafted in Washington. The fact that the only two states with veto power chose abstention is what allowed the plan to pass.

Why the abstentions happened

Their abstentions puzzled many observers. How could two states that condemned the plan's colonial framework allow it to pass? But these questions can't be answered by treating the vote as a move in a geopolitical chess game. The abstentions make sense only when we understand the deeper reality shaping world politics today: The world remains dominated by imperialism, and every struggle – from Gaza to the Sahel to the Caribbean – unfolds inside that system's contradictions.

Both Russia and China sharply criticized the resolution. China warned that the text was "deeply worrisome," lacking any guarantee of Palestinian sovereignty. Russia argued that the plan would entrench occupation, not end it. But neither government challenged the Arab regimes that lined up behind the measure. These regimes are not independent actors exercising sovereign will; they are U.S.-aligned neocolonies, tied to Washington through military dependence, IMF discipline, weapons systems, and security arrangements. Yet they also sit at the center of major trade, energy, and investment networks. Neither Russia nor China was prepared to jeopardize those economic relationships – especially when opposing the resolution would not have stopped Washington's colonial takeover.

States inside an imperialist system

This outcome exposes something crucial: States do not operate outside the global system. They operate inside it – a system still structured by imperialist domination, where a handful of wealthy powers dictate the rules of global politics and where oppressed nations are treated as bargaining chips. Even states at odds with Washington face these pressures.

Russia, as a capitalist state dependent on energy exports and integration into global markets, maneuvers according to the interests of its own ruling class.

China, as a state pursuing a socialist path, must still navigate a world economy dominated by capitalist rules and monopoly power. China's foreign policy reflects the interests of a nation-state operating inside that order – interests that do not always align with international solidarity.

plan: 'A new form of occupation'

Continued from page 8

condemned the idea that humanitarian aid could become a tool of pressure or control under foreign administration.

A project to erase sovereignty

Al-Haq, a leading Palestinian human rights organization, framed the resolution clearly: It is an effort to "entrench the denial of self-determination" and isolate Gaza from the rest of Palestine. Behind the language of "peace" and "transition," Palestinians see an old imperialist strategy at work – a divide-and-conquer operation designed to prevent a unified, sovereign Palestinian state.

An answer rooted in unity

The rejection that followed the resolution's passage was immediate, broad, and unwavering. Political factions, civil society groups, and youth movements – all answered with one voice.

Gaza does not need foreign trustees. Palestine does not need another mandate. And liberation will not come through a board chaired by Donald Trump.

Palestinians made their message unmistakable: Sovereignty cannot be outsourced, and the occupation cannot be repackaged into legitimacy. The struggle for self-determination continues – and no imperialist resolution can redefine it. #

Palestinian child raises the flag over the ruins of his home – a reminder that no imposed plan can extinguish the struggle for self-determination.

about the imperialist world order

Economic entanglements that expose structural limits

These limits are most visible in the economic networks that link governments – including those claiming to oppose U.S. domination – to Israel's role in the imperialist world market. Israel's ports, technology sectors, and energy systems are deeply integrated into global commerce.

China maintains major infrastructure projects in Haifa and Ashdod because it must operate in a global economy still governed by capitalist accumulation, not because it supports Israeli policy. Russia's fuel flows into Israel through Central Asian routes because it is tied to global energy markets structured around profit, not solidarity. India's growing military and energy ties with Israel reflect its ruling-class alignment with Washington's regional agenda.

None of these contradictions arise from political confusion or moral weakness. They emerge from the structure of the world itself – a world where monopoly capital and its institutions bind states into relationships that collide head-on with the demands of workers and oppressed peoples fighting for liberation.

BRICS no substitute for anti-imperialist struggle

The same reality shapes the character of BRICS. Many hoped BRICS would challenge Washington's dominance and create space for sovereign development in the Global South. But BRICS is not a unified alternative to imperialism. It is a coalition of states – some socialist, others deeply capitalist – operating within a world economy still controlled by monopoly capital. BRICS calls for "reform" and "greater representation," not for dismantling the institutions that enforce global inequality.

China participates as a socialist state confronting imperialist pressure, but it cannot use BRICS to overturn a world order still ruled by capitalist domination. The other BRICS governments – India, Brazil, South Africa, Russia, and the expanded membership – defend their own ruling classes' interests, not a collective project of liberation.

Some deepen military cooperation with Washington. Others align with Western corporations while seeking better deals for themselves. These contradictions were visible in the Security Council vote: A formation some imagined would block Washington's colonial plan instead fractured along familiar lines, with states protecting their economic relationships rather than confronting the imperialist system.

What the Security Council vote makes unmistakable is that the power to decide Gaza's future will not come from governments acting within the imperialist system. The forces capable of changing the course of the struggle are the peoples themselves – the resistance in Palestine, the movements for sovereignty rising across the Global South, and the mass mobilizations inside the imperialist centers demanding an end to genocide, war, and occupation. #

No peace on stolen land: protesting the settler fair

By PAL-AWDA NY/NJ

Nov. 19 – Last night, New York City showed up to declare "Death to the IDF" in response to the Nefesh b'Nefesh (NBN) settler recruiting fair, which seeks to recruit American settlers to illegally occupy stolen Palestinian land. As we demonstrated, IOF warplanes were firing missiles into refugee tents in the Old Quarter of Gaza City, murdering at least 40 children, women and men, wiping out several families. It was the 394th time the IOF had violated the "ceasefire."

As intense U.S. and IOF-backed settler violence expands in the West Bank and the Zionist entity's murder toll in Gaza increases daily, Zionists in NYC showed up to the fair with signs reading "80,000 was not enough," and "complete the genocide." Our demand remains clear: our neighborhoods cannot be used for the displacement, murder, and colonization of Palestinian people and land.

Wednesday's NBN recruiting event was a material example of the ongoing colonization of Palestine. As the United Nations Security Council voted to create a U.S.-led security force whose directive is to disarm the Palestinian resistance – echoing the pattern of colonial plans that have sought to strip away Palestinian agency for decades. Past "israeli" government-affiliated organizations like the NBN continue to facilitate the ongoing Nakba in the form of murder, land theft, and dispossession that the genocidal zionist state is built on.

Follow PAL-AWDA on Instagram.

ILWU rank-and-file leader tells students how

By Clarence Thomas Jr.

Clarence Thomas Jr. is a retired third-generation longshore worker from ILWU Local 10, co-founder of the Million Worker March Movement, and co-founder of DeClare Publishing. In this presentation to students, Thomas told them that his activism began in 1967 at San Francisco State College as a member of the Black Student Union, which initiated the longest student strike in U.S. history to establish a Black Studies Department and a School of Ethnic Studies.

On Oct. 30, I had the honor of speaking at the University of California, Berkeley's Department of African American Studies about a subject close to my heart: the International Longshore & Warehouse Union (ILWU) Local 10's pivotal role in the anti-apartheid movement of the 1980s.

Longshore workers are responsible for the loading and discharging of maritime cargo. The cars we drive, the clothes we wear, and the food we eat all pass through the hands of dockworkers. ILWU longshore workers move maritime cargo at all 29 ports on the West Coast, including Hawaii, Alaska, and ports represented by ILWU Canada in Vancouver, BC. We are responsible for making the ports productive, safe, and efficient.

These workers are critical to the global economy. The hands of dockworkers move the commerce of the world, giving them enormous power through collective action. Over the years, ILWU Local 10 has taken historic rank-and-file action in support of domestic and international social justice issues.

A tradition of international solidarity

Beginning in 1935, less than a year after the monumental 1934 West Coast Maritime Strike, Local 10 refused to load nickel and brass destined for the Italian fascist war machine ravaging Ethiopia. Shortly thereafter, members refused to load scrap iron destined for Japan. The union's motto, adopted from the Industrial Workers of the World, is "An injury to one is an injury to all."

Harry Bridges, one of the founders of ILWU and its first international president, said: "Interference with foreign policy of the country? Sure, as hell! That's our job! That's our privilege, that's our right, that's our duty." He made those remarks after President Franklin Delano Roosevelt told him to stay out of U.S. foreign policy matters.

Local 10 activists refused to load U.S.-made military supplies intended for Pinochet's military in Chile and for dictatorships in El Salvador, South Korea, and the Philippines. The positions Local 10 took against apartheid South Africa belong to this tradition spanning more than 80 years.

Understanding apartheid

Apartheid was a system of institutionalized racial segregation and discrimination in South Africa from 1948 to 1994, enforcing the political, social, and economic domination of the white minority over the non-white majority. The word apartheid means "apartness" in Afrikaans (a West Germanic language spoken in South Africa). The system is characterized by racist laws, treating non-white South Africans as inferior and stripping them of all rights.

The method of enforcement was the use of pass laws. Black South Africans had to carry passbooks that included photographs, fingerprints, addresses, the length of time the person had been employed, and other identifying personal information. Employers often entered an evaluation of the pass holder's behavior.

As defined by law, an employer could only be a white person. The passbook also documented when permission was required to enter a certain region and whether the request was denied or granted. Urban areas were considered "white", so a non-white person needed a passbook to be inside a city.

Under the law, any governmental employee could remove these entries, effectively denying permission to remain in the area. If a passbook didn't have an entry, officials could arrest its owner and put them in prison. Colloquially, these passes were called the dompas – Afrikaans for "stupid pass" – a name Black South Africans used to describe the most hated and despicable symbol of apartheid.

Black South Africans often violated the pass laws to find work and support their families, and thus lived under constant threat of fines, harassment, and arrests. Protests against the suffocating laws brought the anti-apartheid struggle, including the Defiance Campaign in the early '50s, and the huge women's protest in Pretoria in 1956.

My wife, Delores Lemon-Thomas, and I recently visited the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg, where we learned of this brutal period of South Africa's history. We also learned about people, organizations, and events that helped to end apartheid.

Local 10's role in the anti-apartheid movement

Dockworkers amass power through collective action and ideological commitment. They can deploy their power on behalf of an array of social movements in their own unions, and countries, as well as beyond their shores. Such a movement was launched when ILWU Local 10 started its solidarity actions to dismantle the apartheid system in South Africa. This movement was led by leftists, both Black and white, in a predominantly African American local.

Dockworkers in Durban, South Africa, conducted work stoppages from the 1940s into the early 1970s. These actions proved to be among the most important forces against apartheid. ILWU Local 10 rank-and-filers were in the vanguard of the movement in the U.S.

Sharpeville massacre

The Sharpeville massacre occurred on March 21, 1960. Some 6,000 people had gathered to protest the injustices of apartheid when police opened fire on the crowd. Sixty-nine people were killed and nearly 200 were wounded – many of them shot in the back.

Following these events, the American Committee on Africa (ACOA), the leading U.S. organization involved in South African liberation solidarity work, called for a boycott of South African goods and the enactment of U.S. sanctions in 1962. The ILWU Longshore Caucus endorsed such boycotts.

On Dec. 17, 1962, ACOA picketed the Dutch ship Raki, which arrived at San Francisco's Pier 19 loaded with asbestos, coffee, and wool from South Africa. They sought to raise awareness of the horrors of apartheid and to encourage the U.S. to join a global boycott of South African goods.

ILWU Local 10 dockers traditionally don't cross picket lines. William Bill Chester, the union's Regional Director for Northern California, the highest-ranking African American in the ILWU, worked closely with Mary Louise Hooper, of the ACOA, in planning the boycott. Almost certainly, the Local 10 boycott was the first anti-apartheid action undertaken by a labor union in U.S. history.

The global struggle against apartheid surged in the 1970s. In 1976, Black students in Soweto took the movement to the next level. Freedom movements in Mozambique and Angola achieved freedom in 1975, and the armed struggle in southern Rhodesia heated up.

The freedom struggles in Africa resulted in the dramatic expansion of global solidarity in the San Francisco Bay Area. Radical rank-and-filers in ILWU Local 10 created the Southern African Liberation Support Committee (SALSC) to support these struggles. Black and white longshore workers' efforts catapulted them to the front of the burgeoning global anti-apartheid movement. San Francisco dockworkers ultimately contributed to the downfall of white minority rule in South Africa.

Brother Leo Robinson, an African American and communist who regularly critiqued capitalism, imperialism, and racism, became interested in South Africa during the Soweto uprising. He wrote a resolution to establish SALSC and boycott South African cargo, which Local 10's Executive Board passed.

SALSC members included David Stewart, Bill Proctor, Larry Wright, Howard Keylor,

Local 10 led the battle against apartheid

Continued from page 10

Charlie Jones, and Leroy "Ned" Ingram – Black and white activists who were socialists or radical unionists who believed that working-class power was strongest on the job and pushed for a boycott of South African cargo.

In July 1976, the ILWU International Executive Board issued communications to all locals regarding a boycott of South African cargo. SALSC helped Local 10 members to pass a resolution condemning the racist laws of South Africa and Rhodesia, which denied human rights to the Black majority.

In 1977, SALSC coordinated a two-day Easter Sunday boycott of the ship, Nedlloyd Kimberley. Some 500 people cheered the ILWU members and hoisted banners. That same year, SALSC collected tons of supplies, loading two 40-foot containers with goods for ANC exiles in Tanzania and Zimbabwean refugees in Mozambique.

ILWU activists also screened the documentary "Last Grave at Dimbaza," secretly filmed in 1973, showing the horrible suffering caused by apartheid. It led to actions up and down the Pacific Coast during the 1970s and '80s.

The historic 1984 boycott

In October 1984, a screening of "Last Grave at Dimbaza" before almost 400 Local 10 members sparked the longest workplace boycott against apartheid in U.S. history. A motion to boycott South African cargo on the next Nedlloyd ship passed resoundingly.

The timing was right because a group of Black South African miners had been arrested and faced long prison sentences. Bay Area longshore workers were ready to act in solidarity.

On Nov. 24, 1984, the Nedlloyd Kimberley arrived at San Francisco's Pier 80 carrying South African cargo. Local 10 activists knew of its arrival thanks to Brother Alex Bagwell, an African American in the clerk's ILWU Local 34.

For the next 10 days, many Bay Area residents gathered daily at the pier's gate. On Dec. 2, about 700 people, from unions, religious groups, and civil rights organizations, rallied at the dock. Brother Leo Robinson described how, "You couldn't get from Army and Third Street to the gate of Pier 80 because it was jampacked with people." Among those who spoke were legendary activist Angela Davis and Congressman Ron Dellums, the most radical member of the House of Representatives.

As employers sought to end the boycott, dockworkers remained steadfast. The Pacific Maritime Association (PMA) proposed unloading the ship elsewhere, but ILWU locals in Stockton, Portland, and Seattle expressed solidarity by refusing to handle "hot cargo."

The PMA then filed a federal injunction calling the work stoppage illegal. The judge declared Local 10 would be fined $200,000 per day for noncompliance. By the end of the standoff, Local 10 faced fines totaling more than $2 million. The injunction singled out Robinson and Keylor for fines of thousands of dollars a day. Local 10 officials maintained the boycott was not union-sanctioned – plausible deniability to prevent financial catastrophe.

Leo Robinson was moved by the killing of South African students who didn't want to speak the Afrikaans language. He wrote a union resolution that led to boycott of South African Cargo on the Nedlloyd Kimberly in the Bay Area.

Finally, on the 11th day, Local 10 members unloaded the cargo. SALSC and Local 10 members felt they had raised awareness of what could be done to oppose apartheid. Bay Area activist and photojournalist David Bacon said, "That was the real birth of the anti-apartheid movement in Northern California."

National impact

The dockworkers' boycott helped inspire students at UC Berkeley to expand their protests in 1985, the largest activism there since the Vietnam War. Thousands rallied, and hundreds erected shantytowns resembling South African townships, leading to repeated clashes with police and heightened public awareness. An ILWU banner displayed the slogan "an injury to one is an injury to all." The protests ultimately forced a very reluctant Board of Regents to divest portions of its $3 billion endowment.

The ILWU embraced the divestment campaigns. In 1986, Oakland closed its account with Bank of America, which conducted business in South Africa, in the most dramatic application of the city's rigorous new South Africa divestment ordinance to date. Bank of America lost the city's $150 million investment portfolio and $120 million annual payroll.

Local 10 exerted influence on Representative Ron Dellums, whose father was a Local 10 member. His uncle, C.L. Dellums, was probably one of the most important Black labor and civil rights leaders in California in the mid-20th century. He was a leader in the BSCP (Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters), the first Black union to be affiliated with the AFL-CIO. He succeeded A. Philip Randolph as its president.

The Washington, D.C.-based Free South Africa Movement, launched sit-ins at the South African embassy in 1984 just three days before the Nedlloyd South African cargo boycott. Local 10's action had a national impact, perhaps never more so than when Congress, led by Ron Dellums, overrode President Ronald Reagan's veto and passed sanctions.

Nelson Mandela's acknowledgment

The ILWU and the Bay Area proved so important that Nelson Mandela visited Oakland Coliseum during his first U.S. tour in 1990 he told 60,000 people: "We salute members of the International Longshore & Warehouse Union Local 10 who refused to unload a South African cargo ship in 1984. In response, other workers, church people, community activists, and educators gathered each day at the docks to express their solidarity with the dockworkers. They established themselves as the frontline of the anti-apartheid movement in the Bay Area."

Mandela later described how this action belongs to the larger fight: "We are part of a worldwide movement. Just as we watched and learned from the continuing struggle within the United States, so too did activists there gain strength from our struggles." Nelson Mandela's praise of Local 10 speaks volumes about the role of unions in the movement.

In 2013, I chaired a Local 10 committee to organize a memorial recognizing Leo Robinson's contributions to the struggle to end apartheid. South African Ambassador Rasool also attended, presenting the Nelson Mandela Humanitarian Award to Leo's widow, Johnnie Robinson. Consul General Cyril S. Ndaba presented the Nelson Mandela Freedom Award and a South African flag to Local 10. Many activists from the anti-apartheid struggle attended.

The history of ILWU Local 10's anti-apartheid activism demonstrates the power of international working-class solidarity. From the first boycott in 1962 to the historic 11-day action in 1984, San Francisco dockworkers proved that organized labor could be a decisive force in global struggles for justice. Their actions inspired a nationwide movement that helped bring down the apartheid regime.

Peter Cole's book, "Dockworker Power: Race and Activism in Durban and the San Francisco Bay Area," was a contributing resource to this report. For speaking engagements or to purchase books from DeClare Publishing – "Mobilizing in Our Own Name - Million Worker March," "Cleophus Williams - My Life Story in the ILWU, Local 10" and "The Year of Good Trouble, 1934" – visit millionworkermarch.com

Bitcoin's latest crash shows what it really is: speculation, not money

By Gary Wilson

Bitcoin just crashed again. After hitting over $126,000 in October, it dropped more than 20% in a few weeks, falling below $90,000. All the gains it made in 2025 – gone.

This wasn't random bad luck. Real pressures drove the crash: Electricity costs soared, making Bitcoin mining less profitable. Over $2.3 billion flowed out of Bitcoin investment funds in just the first half of November. Data shows miners dumped about 71,000 Bitcoins onto exchanges in early November, plus another 210,000 in October – some of the biggest sell-offs since 2022.

These constant wild swings raise a basic question: What is Bitcoin, really? Fans say it's revolutionary money that gets around capitalism's problems. But when you look at it through a Marxist lens, you see something different: Bitcoin isn't money at all. It's a way to gamble on prices going up – what Marx called "fictitious capital."

What does it take to be money?

To understand why Bitcoin fails as money, we need to start with what Marx said money actually is. For Marx, money isn't just a symbol or something the government declares valuable. It's something real that comes out of how people produce and trade goods.

Marx was clear: Money itself must be a commodity – a real thing with physical form. He wrote that money, "the universal commodity," must exist "as a particular commodity alongside the others." Through trading, this "universal equivalent" takes on "the bodily form of a particular commodity."

Throughout history, gold and silver played this role. Why them? Because they have real uses, and because their value comes from the hard work it takes to dig them out of the ground and refine them. That labor-based value made them stable enough to be the anchor for the whole trading system.

Marx insisted this physical foundation matters even when credit systems develop. Paper money and bank deposits aren't new kinds of money – they're IOUs that stand in for the real money (gold) behind them. Capitalism constantly tries to get around the limits of physical money, but as Marx said, "again and again it breaks its back on this barrier."

So for something to be money, it needs three things: It must be a real physical commodity, it must be useful for something besides being money, and its value must come from the labor that went into making it.

Bitcoin fails on every count

Bitcoin doesn't meet any of these requirements.

First, Bitcoin has no real-world use beyond speculation. Gold works in electronics, dentistry, and jewelry. Even if nobody used it as money, gold would still be valuable for these practical purposes. Bitcoin? You can't do anything with it except buy and sell it. It's just data on computers – not a physical thing with actual uses. Without those uses, it can't be the solid foundation Marx described.

Second, Bitcoin's value doesn't come from labor. Gold's value is tied to the hard, costly work of mining and refining it. Bitcoin's price comes from three things instead: its built-in scarcity (only 21 million can ever exist), people betting prices will rise, and collective belief in the system. Yes, Bitcoin "mining" uses tons of electricity, but that's not the same as productive labor that creates something useful. It's just the cost of keeping the network running and checking transactions. That doesn't create value the way mining gold does.

Third, Bitcoin's wild price swings make it useless as a measure of value. Money needs to be stable so people can price things reliably. Something that loses 20% of its value in weeks can't do that job. The recent crash proves it: When electricity got expensive and AI companies offered miners better money, they dumped Bitcoin. That's not how real money behaves.

So what is Bitcoin?

If Bitcoin isn't money, what is it? It's what Marx called "fictitious capital" – a financial asset whose value comes from hoping someone will pay more for it tomorrow, not from any real production.

Stocks and bonds work this way too – they're bets on future profits. Bitcoin fits perfectly. Its price depends entirely on what investors think others will pay for it later.

Think of the art market. A painting by a famous artist can sell for millions, but not because it's useful or produces income. It's expensive because it's rare and people believe others will want it. Bitcoin works the same way. Neither pays dividends nor rent. Both have artificially limited supply – Bitcoin by computer code, art by how much an artist can create. Both markets are controlled by the super-wealthy: "whales" in crypto, big galleries in art. And in both cases, something is worth whatever the next buyer will pay – nothing more, nothing less.

Bitcoin also shows what Marx called "commodity fetishism" – when relationships between people look like relationships between things. Value seems to magically come from the object itself, not from human work. All the computing power and electricity that keeps Bitcoin running is hidden. Its value looks like it just comes from the code, growing on its own without any connection to real work or production. It's the ultimate magic trick.

Reality crashes the party

The proof that Bitcoin is just another investment – not some new kind of money – came with this latest crash. When electricity prices rose, miners had a choice: Keep mining Bitcoin or do something more profitable. They chose profit.

Big mining companies like Core Scientific and Iris Energy signed deals to host AI computers instead. They get paid 3-4 times more per kilowatt-hour than Bitcoin mining paid them. Bitfarms went even further, announcing plans to quit crypto mining completely by 2027.

This shows that even digital "assets" like Bitcoin follow the basic rules of capitalism. Miners ditched Bitcoin because they could make more money elsewhere. It's just another place to invest, not a magical new form of money that escapes capitalism's logic.

Marxist economists point out that if governments could really create crisis-proof money out of thin air, they could solve economic crashes just by printing more. They can't, because money is tied to real commodity production. Bitcoin's failure as stable money proves this point.

Bitcoin isn't a challenge to the system. It's a volatile bet that reflects all the financial chaos of the capitalism it claims to replace. It's trapped by the same contradictions and the same endless chase for profit. #

Japan and U.S. move toward open military confrontation over Taiwan

By Sharon Black

Japan's ultra-rightwing prime minister, Sanae Takaichi, ignited a political storm when she declared that any Chinese move to reunify Taiwan with the mainland would threaten Japan's very survival – and that Tokyo would be ready to join military action to stop it.

For Beijing, the message was clear: Japan was abandoning its long-standing stance of avoiding any commitment to take sides in a conflict over Taiwan and was now declaring that it would join the United States in a military response. Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson Mao Ning denounced the remarks as a serious provocation and a dangerous interference in China's sovereignty.

Japanese right-wing forces further inflamed the situation. Japan's Defense Minister, Shinjiro Koizumi, announced that plans were "steadily moving forward" to deploy a medium-range surface-to-air missile unit at a military base on Yonaguni – an island only 110 kilometers (68 miles) off Taiwan's east coast. A Reuters report quoted Mao Ning warning that "the move is extremely dangerous and should raise serious concerns among nearby countries and the international community," especially in light of Takaichi's earlier comments.

Two Japanese government sources also told Reuters that Donald Trump privately urged Prime Minister Takaichi to tone down her public threats during a call this week. The move fits a familiar Trump pattern: loud public belligerence paired with quiet tactical repositioning when trade negotiations or economic pressure campaigns stall. Some commentators have even coined the acronym "TACO" – "Trump Always Chickens Out" – to describe his habit of retreating behind the scenes after aggressive rhetoric. But far from signaling a real shift, this is political maneuvering. Even as the administration adjusts its tone for trade talks with China, U.S. war planning continues without pause, and Washington is pouring new investments into Japan's military – underscoring that the U.S. strategy in the region is not about peace.

U.S. greenlights new arms for Taiwan

At the same time that Japan was escalating its rhetoric, the United States approved a new $330 million arms package for Taiwan on Nov. 13 – the first such sale under Trump's return to office. The package includes repair parts, non-standard components, and continued support for Taiwan's fleet of F-16 fighter jets, C-130 transport aircraft, and other military systems.

Okinawans protest the U.S. military occupation of their island, which hosts the densest concentration of U.S. bases anywhere in the world. The buildup now plays a central role in U.S.–Japan preparations for confrontation over Taiwan.

Washington's intention is clear: more weapons, deeper military integration with Taiwan, and further preparation for confrontation with China.

A U.S.–Japan military bloc

Japan remains the centerpiece of Washington's military strategy in the western Pacific. The United States operates more than 120 military installations across Japan, including 15 major bases, and stations over 54,000 troops there – the largest concentration of U.S. forces anywhere outside the continental United States. Okinawa carries the heaviest burden of this occupation, with bases crowding the island and dominating local life.

The U.S. has also upgraded and expanded the weapons it deploys and rotates through these bases, tightening its forward position against China. This includes fifth-generation F-35 Lightning II stealth aircraft – with the F-35B variant permanently based at Iwakuni and F-35A rotations continuing at Kadena – as well as V-22 Osprey aircraft operating from Okinawa and Iwakuni. The missile-defense network has been reinforced through Standard Missile-3 interceptors aboard Aegis destroyers homeported in Yokosuka, along with Patriot Advanced Capability-3 batteries across multiple bases. A key recent development is the rotational deployment of the Typhon Mid-Range Capability system, capable of firing both Standard Missile-6 and Tomahawk cruise missiles, giving Washington a new ground-based, long-range strike option aimed directly at China's coastline.

None of this posture is defensive. It is the architecture of a forward-deployed war machine.

How the U.S.–Japan alliance was rebuilt for confrontation

After Japan's defeat in 1945, the United States reshaped the country's political and military structure to serve Washington's aims in Asia. The 1960 U.S.–Japan Security Treaty locked Japan into a permanent, unequal alliance: The U.S. gained open-ended basing rights, and Japan agreed to rely on Washington for its external defense. In practice, the treaty placed Japan squarely inside the U.S. military orbit.

By 1978, updated defense guidelines went even further. For the first time, they committed Japan to joint operations with U.S. forces in "situations in areas surrounding Japan" – diplomatic code for Korea, the Taiwan Strait, and the entire first island chain along China's coastline. This language marked a major shift: Japan was being integrated into U.S. war planning beyond its borders.

For decades, Washington has pressed Japan to dismantle its postwar pacifist constitution, particularly Article 9, which formally renounces war. Right-wing governments – from Abe to Kishida to Takaichi – have steadily chipped away at those restrictions. With full backing from the United States, Japan is now rearming at a pace not seen since World War II and positioning itself as a direct participant in U.S. confrontations with China.

The deep scars of Japanese imperialism

China's response to Japan's new militarism cannot be understood without remembering the past. In the first half of the 20th century, the Japanese Empire invaded, occupied, and devastated large parts of China. This period – known in China as part of the "century of humiliation" – left deep wounds that continue to shape Chinese national memory.

The War of Resistance against Japan (1937–1945) brought mass displacement, famine, and systematic atrocities. The most infamous was the Nanjing Massacre of 1937, when Japanese troops killed an estimated 200,000 civilians and carried out widespread rape and torture. Across the eight-year war, more than 20 million Chinese people were killed – one of the highest death tolls of World War II.

This history is especially present today as China marks the 80th anniversary of the war's end. For the Chinese people, the conflict with

Continued on page 22

‘I will never be a slave again’
Revolutionary legacy Afro-Venezuelans

By Colby Byrd

The following talk by Colby Byrd of the Peoples Power Assembly was given at the “No War on Venezuela” forum held in Baltimore on Nov. 22. The forum was sponsored by Peoples Power Assembly, Struggle for Socialism Party, CPUSA Baltimore Club, Friends of Latin America, Casa Baltimore Limay, ILPS Baltimore/DM, Baltimore Peace Action, Baltimore Vets for Peace, and Black Alliance for Peace–Baltimore. The forum can be viewed on Struggle-La Lucha’s YouTube channel.

Good evening, sisters, brothers and siblings. I just have a couple of brief points on the Afro-Venezuelan situation, both historically and in the modern day.

The story of Afro-Venezuelans is actually integral to the history of Venezuela itself. You have figures like José Leonardo Chirino, who led a slave rebellion against the Spanish known as the Coro Rebellion. Afro-Venezuelans actually celebrate May 10, which was the launch of the Coro Rebellion, as the day to celebrate Afro-Venezuelans.

The Coro Rebellion happened in 1795. Then you have figures like Juana Ramírez and Pedro Camejo. Juana Ramírez was a freedom fighter and leader of an all-women fighting unit – specifically an artillery unit – in the Venezuelan War for Independence in 1813. And Pedro Camejo was a military officer for the Venezuelan Independence Army during the war.

His nickname was “The First Black,” obviously in Spanish – Negro Primero – because he was always the first to make contact with the Spanish military in engagements, leading his men from the front. Also, like our speaker Jesús [Rodríguez-Espinoza] talked about, a lot of what’s going on with U.S. imperialism is due to that white supremacist ideology. They want to make Venezuela a colony. He talked about the far right. It’s these people that hold the idea of Venezuela as a big plantation. That’s what they want, because they see it as a place to put Indigenous populations and populations of color under the boot of imperialism.

Hugo Chávez has this quote where he says, “Hate against me has a lot to do with racism. Because of my big mouth, because of my curly hair. And I’m so proud to have this mouth and this hair, because it’s African.” And it shows the connection between people of the Black diaspora within Latin America and Africa. I love that quote.

You have the uprising beginning on Feb. 27, 1989, when former President Carlos Andrés Pérez implemented what was known as “the package,” which was a deal pushed by the U.S.-backed IMF, the International Monetary Fund. These austerity measures ultimately led to the skyrocketing cost of living for Venezuelans. Venezuela’s working and oppressed communities, most specifically Afro-Venezuelans in the eastern area of Miranda State, took to the streets in protest and were brutally suppressed by the government. Up to 3,000 were killed. This was an early spark for the Bolivarian Revolution led by Chávez.

Colby Byrd of the Peoples Power Assembly discusses the long history of Afro-Venezuelan revolution, going back to slave rebellions in the 1700s.

SSL photo

And Chávez, in his letter to Africa, says:

“I won’t tire of repeating that we are one people. We are obliged to find one another, going beyond formality and discourse, in the same feeling of our unity. Together we must dedicate ourselves to creating conditions that allow us to rescue our peoples from the maze they were thrown into, first by colonialism and then by the neoliberal capitalism of the 20th century.”

He identified that through the quest of beating imperialism and beating its minions in white supremacy, there’s obviously a building of connection between African struggles and struggles in Latin America – fighting colonialism, fighting imperialism, and the siphoning

Continued on page 15

Black solidarity with Venezuela

By the December 12th Movement

Recent U.S. military provocations of war in South America reveal Black and working-class interest in opposition to U.S. imperialism. The Trump regime and previous U.S. administrations have historically labeled the President Maduro regime anti-democratic. In May of 2025, Trump accused Venezuela’s government of working with the criminal organization Tren de Aragua to wage a small-scale war on American soil, an obvious pretext for regime change. This calls for solidarity with Venezuela, including from our brothers and sisters serving in the U.S. armed forces.

Black and Venezuelan ties go back for centuries. In 1811, during Venezuela’s independence movement, Haitian soldiers, the Western hemisphere’s first free republic, sailed south from Haiti to take up arms to aid Simón Bolívar and Venezuelans in their quest for liberation. This action was not forgotten as the late Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez offered low-cost oil to Haiti following its devastating earthquake in 2010. Chavez also supplied low-cost heating oil to Black and Brown communities in the Bronx and Boston, poor families, homeless shelters, and Native American villages. Venezuela has used its deep oil deposits to provide low-cost fuel to the Caribbean and Latin American partners for decades. Venezuela was also there for victims of Hurricane Katrina.

After coming to power in 1999, Chavez, and later current president Nicolas Maduro, improved the lives of Black and Indigenous people within Venezuela, improving their access to economic, social, and political rights. Prior to U.S. sanctions on Venezuela, broad social spending from the party was responsible for lifting many Black and Brown people out of poverty and expanding literacy to millions.

At present, it is urgent to consider the implications of the solidarity that Venezuela has shown with working-class people of the Americas. More than 60 Venezuelan civilians have been killed by the U.S. since Sept. 2. We are now witnessing the largest U.S. military buildup in the Caribbean since the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962.

On those ships are Black troops, many that find their origins in the same Caribbean now extorted for Washington’s interest. U.S. naval Admiral Alvin Holsey abruptly retired in the wake of the attacks on Venezuelan boats. Holsey, a Black man, resigned after expressing concerns about targeting civilian or non-military vessels. Legal experts agree with Holsey,

Continued on page 15

Continued from page 14

of resources away. The Bolivarian Revolution is also seen as being so tied with Blackness in the country.

A grim example of this is the lynching of Orlando Figuera, who was a 21-year-old grocery store worker who, in 2017, found himself in the middle of opposition protests against the Bolivarian revolutionary government. It cost him his life when protesters saw him leaving work and shouted, "Hey Black guy, you look like a Chavista! Are you a Chavista? You'll see what happens to Chavistas!"

Given the long line of Afro-Venezuelan history – fighting for independence against Spanish colonialism, fighting against U.S. imperialism – the very sight of Blackness is seen as something revolutionary, as something combative to the face of white supremacy. And one point that Jesús said that mirrors this quote here, where he talks about how the Bolivarian Revolution will live past Maduro, live past these leadership figures, because they're fighting for something so much more.

And this quote by Afro-Venezuelan activist Mariela Machado, where she talks about why Afro-Venezuelans support the Bolivarian Revolution and why they support Maduro, is:

"We are clear that we voted for Nicolás Maduro. We elected him so that he could continue the policies of Hugo Chávez. He must deepen the policies around the communes and communal power, because the people will save the people. The rights of women have been recognized, which is key, but it's not just that. I am Black and poor, and I will never be a slave again because I have lived a process of profound liberation where I can say whatever I feel like saying, like I'm doing right now. There is no way we will return to the past."

And that is the dedication that I think Jesús is talking about. They're fighting. They will not return to slavery. They will not return to bondage. It's progress or death, as we see in Venezuela, here in the U.S., in Haiti, in Palestine – everywhere. Thank you. #

Hands off Venezuela! Wall Street antiwar rally

By Stephen Millies

Protesters rallied on Wall Street on Nov. 22 to defend Venezuela from Trump and the Pentagon. The speak-out and march was one of many events called by the United National Antiwar Coalition against the impending war for Big Oil.

People chanted "No troops on the ground, no bombs in the air!" in front of the Trump Building at 40 Wall Street. Nearby was the world's biggest casino, the New York Stock Exchange. It was the 62nd anniversary of the CIA's regime change in Dallas back on Nov. 22, 1963.

Michela Martinazzi of the Freedom Road Socialist Organization chaired the rally that condemned the ICE gestapo raids and the murders in the Caribbean. Roger Wareham of the December 12th Movement reminded people that the late President Hugo Chavez provided free heating oil for poor people in the United States.

Lucy Pagoada spoke of the important Nov. 30 presidential election in Honduras. The Trump regime wants to return the Central American country to being a U.S. colony. Later that day a rally was held in Times Square to support the Libre Party candidate Rixi Moncada.

An activist told of the struggle at the old, shut-down, Brooklyn Naval Yard against the makers of drones for ICE and the Zionist regime. Other speakers included those from the Workers World Party and the Internationalist Group.

People marched across the financial district to hold a final rally at the Oculus shopping and transportation center. It cost $4 billion to erect. That's enough money to build 10,000 apartments for homeless families at $400,000 apiece.

While there are 100,000 homeless schoolchildren in New York City – the capital of capitalism – there are no homeless children in Venezuela. The Bolivarian Republic has built five million homes for people.

In Times Square, activist Lucy Pagoada spoke about the upcoming presidential election in Honduras, supporting candidate Rixi Moncada. This is an important election because the Honduran people are still working to regain control of their country after the Washington- backed coup in 2009. The 2021 election of sitting President Xiomara Castro began that process, and the current election takes place as Trump attempts to claw back control of the region for Wall Street.

The people of Venezuela will defend their revolution. No war in Venezuela! No troops on U.S. streets! #

SLL photos: Stephen Millies

Continued from page 14

suggesting that simply characterizing drug cartels as terrorists did not give the administration any additional authority to use lethal force. Holsey should be a beacon for all servicemen – but especially Black and Brown.

As Malcolm X said:

"When the Black man was asleep, he was anyone's tool, he was anyone's watchdog, he was anyone's houndog, hunting dog, but today the Black man in America is beginning to think for himself. As he begins to think for himself, he begins to ask himself what he is fighting for. And what has he gotten out of all of the fighting that he has already done? And as the Black man begins to ask himself this question, then you will find that many of them begin to wonder what do we have to fight for."

What is the reality back at home for American troops? Trump's administration withheld SNAP benefits from working-class Americans as a bargaining chip in a political negotiation. Americans do not exercise the broad social spending of Venezuela to alleviate poverty, with the result being record inequality and a new record in household debt of $18.59 trillion, as Americans struggle with the rising cost of living. In addition, U.S. urban populations have found themselves the target of a war within, with troops and secret police (ICE) being unleashed in an obvious political nature. Images of Black and Brown Americans in cities like Chicago being zip-tied and kidnapped have angered many, with calls for answers against actions that stand at odds to democracy. As to our Black and Brown servicemen:

We are calling for solidarity with the Venezuelan people and the ruling party. They have shown their commitment to the working class here in the Americas, and in their dire time, we must return the support. To our servicemen faced with following orders to feed their families, we understand the contradiction. We all face these challenges to survive the capitalist system. We do ask, however, that you read more about Venezuela and its commitment to improving the lives of the poor here in America and the Caribbean. #

You can't build a revolution on Instagram: Cuba and Venezuela explain why

By Lev Koufax

An international conference in Havana on Oct. 15 – the third annual International Meeting of Theoretical Publications of Left-wing Parties and Movements (Encuentro Internacional de Publicaciones Teóricas de Partidos y Movimientos de Izquierda) – brought together communist and progressive forces from across the world. Delegations included the Communist Party of India, the Communist Party of Greece, the Belgian Workers' Party, the Hungarian Workers' Party, Ireland's largest trade union, and dozens of other organizations. Organized by the Communist Party of Cuba, with President Miguel Díaz-Canel participating in multiple sessions, the gathering focused on a critical question: How can the working class win the information war?

One country dominated the discussions: Venezuela. Latin American participants emphasized that Venezuela sits on the front lines of U.S. imperialist aggression, making it a testing ground for both Trump's neo-fascist ideology and new forms of information warfare. The insights shared by Cuban and Venezuelan speakers – particularly President Díaz-Canel, Ignacio Ramonet (Fidel Castro's biographer), and Miguel Pérez Pirela, the Venezuelan philosopher who leads the Network in Defense of Humanity – demand serious attention from the U.S. left.

Their central argument was clear: Social media platforms are tools of class warfare, and the left in the United States has fundamentally misunderstood how to use them.

Google's AI: Manufacturing consent at scale

Artificial intelligence has become imperialism's latest propaganda weapon. Díaz-Canel described how Google's AI summaries routinely present Cuba through a distorted, hostile lens. When ordinary people search for information about Cuba – including Cubans themselves – Google's AI generates a short "overview" that frames the island as a dictatorship without basic rights or freedoms. These summaries appear at the top of search results with an authoritative sheen.

The system does not invent new information; it synthesizes the dominant narratives already produced by Western media and official U.S. sources. Research on search-engine behavior shows that most users never look beyond the first short block of information they see, giving these AI-generated snapshots enormous influence.

Cuba has responded by assembling programming teams to develop alternative AI-assisted search tools that elevate progressive sources. At the same time, presenters explained that Cuban researchers are attempting to flood Google's AI systems with corrective information to counter the most extreme distortions. As Díaz-Canel and Vasuki Umantha of the Communist Party of India both emphasized: Technology serves the class that controls it. The question is not whether AI is "objective," but whether it advances working-class interests or ruling-class power.

President Díaz-Canel addresses delegates in Havana about the growing role of artificial intelligence in imperialist information warfare.

One Piece flag spreads while Che's image fades

Ignacio Ramonet posed a provocative question about political imagery in the digital age. Why do certain symbols – like the One Piece pirate flag, which has become a youth-culture emblem of rebellion and adventure – spread virally across color revolutions in multiple countries, while progressive symbols such as Che Guevara's face, the hammer and sickle, or the Black Power fist circulate far less widely today?

Ramonet said that the answer lies in how social media algorithms operate. These systems accelerate and amplify content that aligns with ruling-class interests. Generic "anti-corruption" imagery – often stripped of any class analysis and weaponized by right-wing movements – spreads far more easily than symbols rooted in socialist struggle. The platforms promote what destabilizes governments targeted by the U.S. and suppress what strengthens working-class movements.

This is not mere coincidence. It reflects the class character embedded in the design of the platforms themselves.

The fundamental mistake

Miguel Pérez Pirela – whose flight to Havana was delayed by U.S. military aircraft operating near Caracas airport – delivered the conference's most comprehensive analysis of social media. Even though he has more than a million followers on X (formerly Twitter) and uses the platform effectively, he argues that corporate social media is fundamentally hostile to anti-imperialist politics.

Venezuela and other left movements made a critical strategic mistake: trying to adapt robust left-wing content – newspaper articles, theoretical works, deep political analysis – into short social-media formats, assuming this would reach the masses. This approach treats the platforms as neutral tools that simply need the "right" content. It fails.

Meta, X, and similar platforms cannot build revolutionary movements or even real community. They create the illusion of connection while isolating people in algorithm-controlled silos. Their systems bury left-wing material and prioritize propaganda from the U.S. government, corporate media, and far-right actors.

These are not public squares. They are privately owned, billionaire-controlled propaganda machines.

The war for attention

Pérez Pirela framed the information struggle as fundamentally "a war for attention." The battle between imperialism and the global working class is not only about ideas – it is about getting people to look in the first place.

Right-wing forces dominate this terrain. Trump says something outrageous and the platforms instantly magnify it. A dramatic crisis unfolds – a boat explosion in the Caribbean, an inflammatory speech, a staged provocation – and it floods every feed. Even when media coverage is negative, the attention still flows toward ruling-class narratives.

By the time the left offers a substantive response, the algorithmic firehose has already shaped public perception.

Social media only becomes "useful" when the movement being promoted serves ruling-class interests: color revolutions, right-wing street uprisings, neo-fascist organizing. The Jan. 6 coup attempt spread effortlessly through Facebook and similar platforms.

The 2019 U.S. attempt to install Juan Guaidó as a puppet leader demonstrated this clearly. Venezuelan opposition organizers exploited Facebook's design – a system built to prioritize right-wing extremism – to spread false claims and confusion. The crisis forced Venezuelan revolutionaries to fundamentally reassess how they approached digital information warfare.

A strategic reorientation

Cuban and Venezuelan revolutionaries have learned through hard experience that mainstream social media serves the class enemy. The

Continued on page 17

Continued from page 16

task is not to abandon these platforms entirely, but to understand their strictly limited purpose.

The emerging strategy uses social media sparingly: sharp visuals and concise slogans that redirect people away from these platforms and toward anti-imperialist sources – demonstrations, left-wing books, revolutionary websites, political study, organizing work, petitioning, canvassing, writing for socialist publications.

Venezuela's Network in Defense of Humanity has developed practical innovations. Books include QR codes linking to videos of the text being read, creating an audio-visual entry point that pulls readers out of what Pérez Pirela calls the "cesspit of social media" – not simply a metaphor but a description of platforms engineered to trap users in endless, isolating consumption.

The goal is to move people from passive scrolling toward collective political education and struggle. TikTok and Instagram may serve as initial points of contact, but serious political work must take place elsewhere.

Silicon Valley's mantle

For decades, the primary tools of U.S. imperialist information warfare were corporate media and Hollywood. Today, that mantle has been seized by Silicon Valley. The major tech corporations function as the new ideological arm of the ruling class, shaping global narratives at unprecedented speed and scale.

The U.S. progressive movement must stop adapting substantial political materials to platforms built to suppress them. We should expect Silicon Valley to wield its power aggressively – because these tools were created by capitalists to defend capitalist rule.

Revolutionary politics must be built in the streets, in study circles, in workplaces, and through direct organization. Mainstream social media was built by imperialists to function on behalf of imperialism. Cuba and Venezuela are developing new methods of political education precisely because they recognize this.

We can learn

The U.S. left faces a choice. We can keep treating social media as if it were a neutral tool that simply needs better content – and watch our message disappear into the circus controlled by Musk and Zuckerberg. Or we can learn from comrades on the front lines of information warfare.

This means thinking critically about technology and class power. It means using social media strategically and minimally. It means prioritizing face-to-face organizing, physical media, political education, and collective struggle over viral posts and follower counts.

The Cuban and Venezuelan people are offering hard-won lessons. It is our responsibility to study them – and to act.

Adapted from remarks delivered at a Struggle for Socialism Party membership meeting.

Eyewitness accounts bring Cuban socialism to life

Activists who recently traveled to Cuba spoke about the experience at a meeting in Los Angeles. From left to right: Andrew Matatag, Onyinye Alheri, Lizbeth Antonio, and Maggie Vascassenno.

SLL photo

By Andrew Matatag

Los Angeles – Delegates who recently traveled to Cuba shared their experiences at a public meeting on Nov. 14 at the Harriet Tubman Center for Social Justice. The "Eyewitness: ¡Cuba Socialista!" presentation brought the reality of Cuban socialism to life through first-hand accounts.

The delegates from the U.S., representing Struggle-La Lucha and the Struggle for Socialism Party, traveled to Cuba on two occasions. The first was for the launch of the book "Love is the law: Cuba's queer rights revolution," and the second was to attend the Third International Meeting on Theoretical Publications of Left-Wing Parties and Movements and the First Granma-Rebelde Festival.

The presentation began with a basic history of Cuba, beginning with Spanish colonial rule – a crucial part of understanding Cuba on its own terms and in its own historical context. Cuba's socialist revolution and its accomplishments are a product of, and counter to, its exploitation and domination by Spain and the United States.

One presenter told of their participation in the book launch of "Love is the law." There was a lovely coincidence in which an LGBTQ delegation of the Venceremos Brigade happened upon the book launch and stayed to hear the presentations.

Another presenter detailed their first time in Cuba as a participant of the Third International Meeting on Theoretical Publications of Left-Wing Parties and Movements and the First Granma-Rebelde Festival. In addition to the conference lessons already published in Struggle-La Lucha, this presenter put emphasis on seeing a better world, a socialist system, in practice.

They reflected on visiting a neighborhood block party put on by its Committee for the Defense of the Revolution (CDR) and meeting its president. "The president and the CDR are responsible for identifying its people's needs and making sure they are connected to whatever resources they need. It is truly a people-oriented system."

Both presenters and participants committed to building a mass movement to end the U.S. blockade of Cuba and to remove Cuba from the list of "state sponsors of terror." #

Whose news?

Continued from page 6

sition to the ICE attacks on immigrants and protests against the genocide of Palestinians in Gaza are signs of resistance.

Now is the time to build resistance, to reach out and strengthen communications through our unions and communities – to confidently raise our voices, saying we can build a better world.

Fidel Castro's centenary will be celebrated on August 13, 2026, marking what would have been his 100th birthday. A comprehensive program of commemorative activities, titled "100 Years with Fidel" (#100AñosConFidel), has been launched by Cuba and solidarity organizations worldwide, extending through November 2026.

LOVE IS THE LAW Cuba's Queer Rights Revolution
tinyurl.com/Cuba-LoveisLaw tinyurl.com/Read-LOVEistheLAW

Bolivarian Revolution is bigger than Maduro:

By Jesús Rodríguez-Espinoza

The following talk by Jesús Rodríguez-Espinoza was given at the "No War on Venezuela" forum held in Baltimore on Nov. 22. Rodríguez-Espinoza is a former Consul General of Venezuela in Chicago and a seasoned analyst of international relations and Venezuelan politics. He was a founding editor of Aporrea.org and is the founder of the renowned anti-imperialist news outlet, Orinoco Tribune.

The forum was sponsored by the Peoples Power Assembly, Struggle for Socialism Party, CPUSA Baltimore Club, Friends of Latin America, Casa Baltimore Limay, ILPS Baltimore / DM, Baltimore Peace Action, Baltimore Vets for Peace, and Black Alliance for Peace, Baltimore. The forum can be viewed on Struggle - La Lucha's YouTube channel.

Thank you for the invitation, comrades. And thank you for organizing these events, especially under the current circumstances, under the current unprecedented U.S. military deployment in the region. So first, I want to try to explain the way I see the geopolitical context around this situation.

So basically, it reminds me of the first things that President Trump said when he initiated his new term. And I remember that when I heard that he was talking about having control of Greenland, or annexing Canada, or changing the name of the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of America, or retaking the Panama Canal, I initially thought that those were crazy statements, usual for the way Donald Trump behaves.

But right now I see it differently, especially after reading and listening to analysts and experts and thinkers talking about how the U.S. has been realizing that there's a change in the correlations of forces worldwide. And the U.S. is just trying to secure the place – the area that it considers its domain, its backyard, its neighborhood, whatever name you want to put on it.

But that's basically what has been happening.

And this military deployment in the Caribbean and this stress of military invasion or attacks against Venezuela are just an expression of that approach, that new foreign policy approach coming from the U.S. And it's not because President Trump is extremely brilliant or whatever. Those plans have been designed for years by the oligarchy in the U.S., by those who control the U.S., which are the corporations. So, they basically want to secure access to natural resources and to markets in this part of the world. Because Russia and China – and other countries, like India or Turkey or South Africa – have been disputing the preeminence and the supremacy that the U.S. has exercised for several decades, especially after the fall of the Soviet Union in the '90s.

That's the general context of this situation that is affecting us. And bringing it down to reality takes us to what I just mentioned, which is the natural resources. Within this global scenario, the U.S. needs to secure natural resources from the region, and Venezuela is one of those countries in the region that has happened to have the biggest oil reserve in the world. So, it's strategic for a country like the U.S.

That's basically the context of what is happening, and I add to that context the element of the "bad example" – quote, unquote – of Venezuela. Because Venezuela represents a country that does not submit to U.S. dictates, does not obey what Washington says we should do or not do. And for that reason, it's also important for the U.S. to get rid of countries like Venezuela, Cuba, and Nicaragua.

The aggression against Venezuela should be understood within that context. And getting rid of Venezuela – for those in the U.S. who are dreaming of doing that – will signify an escalation against Cuba and Nicaragua, and maybe other countries. We are actually seeing that even Colombia, which has this president who is not like a socialist, Marxist, or whatever, has been threatened by the U.S. in recent weeks. The president of Mexico has also been threatened.

That gives you an idea on how things are happening, and the risk, and the causes of what is happening. So, I wanted to talk about those things before going into the details about Venezuela. Another thing that I believe is important, and that I say is that whatever you hear about Venezuela being a dictatorship, or authoritarian, and that Maduro is an authoritarian tropical dictator, and human rights are terrible here in Venezuela – those things are humongous lies. I mean, I'm not saying that Venezuela is perfect. No country is perfect. But we are far from how the U.S. mainstream media describes us.

It's extremely important that people do not fall into those narratives about us being a rogue nation, a narco-state. That's the big lie that they have been trying to sell recently. I mean, the U.S. has been trying to oust Chavismo – the Bolivarian revolution – since Hugo Chávez took office in 1999. We are talking about 25 years of U.S. attempts to promote regime change in Venezuela, and they have not succeeded.

They have not succeeded because the Bolivarian revolution and Chavismo are not only rooted in the leadership. It's something that goes beyond President Chávez or President Maduro or the current leadership of the Venezuelan government. So, for that reason, the U.S. has not been able to create a regime change here in the country.

But anyway, I need to explain to you what is happening in terms of the threat and the recent U.S. deployment, and what is happening in the region. In August of this year, President Trump, the Department of Justice of the U.S., raised the bounty on President Maduro from $25 million to $50 million. So this is a bounty on President Maduro, dead or alive. It's a price on his head. The mainstream media tries to present these bounties with beautiful words, but that is basically what it is. The U.S. is giving money to whoever decides to get rid of President Maduro to capture or kill him to receive this bounty. That is not new. The first bounty on President Maduro was announced by the U.S. in 2019, and it was for $15 million. Then it was raised in January this year to $25 million, and then in August, as I said, that was raised to $50 million.

This is important because far-right opposition politicians in Venezuela, together with far-right people in the U.S., like Marco Rubio and the crazy Cuban congresspeople (the crazy Cubans, as they call them) have been pushing for several months already to raise the bounty on President Maduro to $100 million, because that's the money that mercenaries like Eric Prince have said publicly that they will need in order to launch a mercenary operation to try to kill President Maduro. So that's why the issue of the bounty is relevant.

Actually, a few months ago, Mario Díaz-Balart, who belongs to the crazy Cuban group and is a representative from Florida, introduced a proposal or resolution in the U.S. Congress calling for the bounty to be raised to $100 million. A few days after the bounty on Maduro was raised to $50 million, the New York Times "leaked" – quote, unquote – this information about President Trump signing these secret memoranda about the deployment that we have seen in the Caribbean in recent weeks.

And what does this deployment mean? Right now in front of Venezuela, I believe that there are about 11 or 12 warships from the U.S. Navy, the biggest and newest U.S. aircraft carrier, the Gerald Ford aircraft carrier, one nuclear submarine and one regular submarine have been reported by the mainstream media in recent days.

We are talking about 15,000 U.S. troops near the coast of Venezuela. This is a military move not seen in this part of the world since the '80s. For at least 40 years, something like this was not seen in this part of the world. And a movement of this size is not easy to disband without "presenting results," between quotations. So for that reason, many people around the world, and of course in Venezuela, have been denouncing this as basically a U.S. regime change operation against President Maduro, against Chavismo in Venezuela. And some people are

Venezuelans ready to defend their country

saying that this threat might become a military invasion. But at least for now, the number of troops that we are seeing is not enough to launch a military invasion against Venezuela.

Because, for example, the military invasion against Panama in the '80s required around 30,000 U.S. troops. Right now, the U.S. only has half that amount of troops near Venezuela. So, it's gonna be hard for the U.S. to do a military invasion with the forces that we currently see. That doesn't mean that the U.S. cannot quickly amass more troops near Venezuela. We cannot discard the possibility of a military invasion. But as the situation is right now, people say that it's very probable that airstrikes can happen – decapitation strikes, which means that the U.S. will try to kill the leadership of Chavismo. That's a real possibility, and that's what many of us here in Venezuela have been worried about in recent weeks.

That's the context of the military deployment. The argument from the U.S. is that they are in a new war on drugs to try to protect the U.S. people. We all know that's a big lie. Because if the U.S. really wants to protect the U.S. people from drugs, it would first get rid of the cartels that operate in the U.S.

I'm talking about white people cartels, not Mexican or Colombian cartels – the people that move the drugs in the US. And secondly, they should do real and comprehensive programs to try to help the U.S. people caught in drug addictions and try to do a massive program to really try to get U.S. people out of drugs.

That's the reality. And the drugs go to the U.S. because the biggest market for drugs is there. That's why drugs go to the U.S. You are never going to end the drug crime business by going to the source of the cocaine or other crops that are used to fabricate drugs.

But that's been the argument of the U.S. And with that argument, they have already killed 83 people – civilians – in small boats in the Caribbean, raising a lot of alarms all over the world and even in the U.S. about the legality of this. You know, you cannot kill someone just because you were tipped by an informant that the boat carries drugs, because there are often mistakes in the intelligence. Experts say that with seizures of drugs in the Caribbean using the regular procedures, there is a mistake rate of 25%. [This comes from the U.S. Coast Guard's fiscal year 2024 performance report.]

So what I'm trying to tell you is that maybe out of those 83 souls that have been killed in the Caribbean, if we take for granted that they were really tipped to be small boats carrying drugs, at least 20 of those people might have been innocent. The operation is a big mistake. It has been criticized. And I'm pretty sure that eventually it will be stopped. And a lot of people are going to be indicted because it's illegal under all the laws that you want to consider.

And the people are not only from Venezuela, but also from Colombia, Trinidad and Tobago, and even from Ecuador. A survivor from Ecuador has been targeted by these strikes. So that's the panorama of the current situation that we've seen in the Caribbean. And there's rhetoric coming from Washington about striking allegedly drug production facilities in Venezuela and drug lords, allegedly, and they have accused President Maduro of being the head of a cartel that is nonexistent, which is the Cartel of the Suns.

They created this play cartel just to try to associate President Maduro to that cartel and justify attacks against Venezuela. But they also accused him of being linked to the Tren de Aragua, which is a criminal gang that actually did not have anything to do, at least in big terms, with drugs. And when they raised the bounty on President Maduro in August, they also accused him of having links with the Mexican Sinaloa cartel. So they accused President Maduro of being worse than Pablo Escobar in Colombia in the '80s. So that's to give you an idea of the whole manipulation. But this is a narrative used to support attacks and a regime change operation, and these military strikes against Venezuela.

So that's basically the context of what is happening right now. And that has already created a lot of tensions in the region. President Petro of Colombia has been denouncing these attacks, because Colombians were already targeted by these attacks. President Petro has been saying that he is not going to allow the use of Colombian soil for any military attacks against Venezuela. And the president of Brazil has been questioning and criticizing the U.S. deployment. There's a growing rejection of this U.S. military operation in the Caribbean and the threats against Venezuela.

A few weeks ago, CELAC [the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States] had a summit, and in its final declaration, the majority of countries of CELAC agreed that the zone of peace in Latin America, declared by CELAC in 2014, needs to be respected, that Latin America and the Caribbean should be considered a zone of peace. And there shouldn't be military strikes and military tensions in the region. Meanwhile, in Venezuela, we have not been sitting here waiting for the gringos to invade us. We are preparing ourselves for whatever the gringos want to do.

When this thing began, President Maduro asked the Venezuelans to voluntarily enlist in the Bolivarian militia. And the Bolivarian militia in Venezuela is not like the militias that you have there in Indiana or Minnesota, of white people that hate the federal government, shooting and doing crazy stuff. The Bolivarian Militia in Venezuela is part of the army. It's one additional branch of the army. And it's important to highlight this because mainstream media and social media have been spreading that President Maduro is giving away guns and weapons to everyone. And that's not true. Before that call, the Bolivarian militia already had a big amount of enlisted troops, close to 4.5 million people.

When President Maduro made the call for voluntary enlistment, that number rose, according to government figures, to 3 million additional militia people. So, according to government figures, Venezuela should have about 8 million militia people. Maybe the government is exaggerating. If you ask me, I believe that the real number might be around 6 or 6.5 million people, but that is an incredible number anyway. And that number has always scared the U.S. military because not too many countries have a militia of that size.

And with the enlistment of new militia people, the government and the military announced these exercises – military drills all over the country in training of these new militia people for fighting, training in the use of arms, in health care, in emergency situations, all the training that is needed for situations like this.

And that has been done by the government and the institutions of Venezuela in a very responsible way, without creating alarm or without having tanks and things in the street all over. The whole process has been performed in a very responsible way to avoid creating panic among the population. Actually, they have been asking us not to get into panic and fake news, to keep doing our regular stuff without affecting our work or the productive activities that we do.

And when the Gerald Ford aircraft carrier arrived a few days ago in the Caribbean, Venezuela announced the continuation of the relaunching of these military drills with 200,000 troops deployed all over the territory. And that military drill continues. Because the threat is imminent, it's real.

Actually, a few days ago, for the last two or three weeks, there was GPS jamming all over Venezuela because no one knows if that was created by the U.S. government or if it was a defensive mechanism used by the military of Venezuela to try to mess with the U.S. operations close to our borders. But anyway, those things affect us and create some tension among Venezuelans because when those things happen, you begin to think that something bigger might happen eventually, very soon. Alarm exists here, but we are not in panic.

We are worried, but we are ready to defend the country. And Chavismo is going to remain

Continued on page 21

La Revolución Bolivariana es más grande que Maduro

Continua de página 24

dice que debemos o no debemos hacer. Y por esa razón, también es importante para Estados Unidos deshacerse de países como Venezuela, Cuba y Nicaragua.

La agresión contra Venezuela debe entenderse dentro de ese contexto. Y deshacerse de Venezuela —para aquellos en Estados Unidos que sueñan con hacer eso— significará una escalada contra Cuba y Nicaragua, y quizás otros países. De hecho, estamos viendo que incluso Colombia, que tiene este presidente que no es como un socialista, marxista, ni nada por el estilo, ha sido amenazada por Estados Unidos en semanas recientes. El presidente de México también ha sido amenazado.

Eso les da una idea de cómo están ocurriendo las cosas, y el riesgo, y las causas de lo que está pasando. Así que quería hablar sobre esas cosas antes de entrar en los detalles sobre Venezuela. Otra cosa que creo que es importante, y que digo, es que todo lo que escuchen sobre Venezuela siendo una dictadura, o autoritaria, y que Maduro es un dictador tropical autoritario, y que los derechos humanos son terribles aquí en Venezuela —esas cosas son mentiras descomunales—. Quiero decir, no estoy diciendo que Venezuela sea perfecta. Ningún país es perfecto. Pero estamos lejos de cómo los medios de comunicación dominantes estadounidenses nos describen.

Es extremadamente importante que la gente no caiga en esas narrativas sobre que somos un estado canalla, un narcoestado. Esa es la gran mentira que han estado tratando de vender recientemente. Quiero decir, Estados Unidos ha estado tratando de derrocar al chavismo —la revolución bolivariana— desde que Hugo Chávez asumió el cargo en 1999. Estamos hablando de 25 años de intentos estadounidenses de promover un cambio de régimen en Venezuela, y no han tenido éxito.

No han tenido éxito porque la revolución bolivariana y el chavismo no solo están arraigados en el liderazgo. Es algo que va más allá del presidente Chávez o del presidente Maduro o del liderazgo actual del gobierno venezolano. Así que por esa razón, Estados Unidos no ha podido crear un cambio de régimen aquí en el país.

Pero de todas formas, necesito explicarles lo que está ocurriendo en términos de la amenaza y el reciente despliegue estadounidense, y lo que está pasando en la región. En agosto de este año, el presidente Trump, el Departamento de Justicia de Estados Unidos, aumentó la recompensa por el presidente Maduro de 25 millones de dólares a 50 millones de dólares. Así que esta es una recompensa por el presidente Maduro, vivo o muerto. Es un precio sobre su cabeza. Los medios de comunicación dominantes tratan de presentar estas recompensas con palabras bonitas, pero básicamente es eso. Estados Unidos está dando dinero a quien decida deshacerse del presidente Maduro, capturarlo o matarlo para recibir esta recompensa.

Eso no es nuevo. La primera recompensa por el presidente Maduro fue anunciada por Estados Unidos en 2019, y era de 15 millones de dólares. Luego fue aumentada en enero de este año a 25 millones de dólares, y luego en agosto, como dije, fue aumentada a 50 millones de dólares.

Esto es importante porque políticos de la oposición de extrema derecha en Venezuela, junto con gente de extrema derecha en Estados Unidos, como Marco Rubio y los congresistas cubanos locos (los cubanos locos, como los llaman) han estado presionando durante varios meses ya para que se aumente la recompensa por el presidente Maduro a 100 millones de dólares, porque ese es el dinero que mercenarios como Eric Prince han dicho públicamente que necesitarán para lanzar una operación mercenaria para tratar de matar al presidente Maduro. Así que por eso el tema de la recompensa es relevante.

De hecho, hace unos meses, Mario Díaz-Balart, quien pertenece al grupo de cubanos locos y es representante de Florida, introdujo una propuesta o resolución en el Congreso estadounidense pidiendo que se aumente la recompensa a 100 millones de dólares. Unos días después de que la recompensa por Maduro fuera aumentada a 50 millones de dólares, el New York Times "filtró" —entre comillas— esta información sobre el presidente Trump firmando estos memorandos secretos sobre el despliegue que hemos visto en el Caribe en semanas recientes.

¿Y qué significa este despliegue? Ahora mismo frente a Venezuela, creo que hay alrededor de 11 o 12 buques de guerra de la Marina estadounidense, el portaaviones más grande y nuevo de Estados Unidos, el portaaviones Gerald Ford, un submarino nuclear y un submarino regular han sido reportados por los medios de comunicación dominantes en días recientes.

Estamos hablando de 15.000 tropas estadounidenses cerca de la costa de Venezuela. Este es un movimiento militar no visto en esta parte del mundo desde los años 80. Por al menos 40 años, algo así no se había visto en esta parte del mundo. Y un movimiento de este tamaño no es fácil de desmantelar sin "presentar resultados", entre comillas. Así que por esa razón, mucha gente alrededor del mundo, y por supuesto en Venezuela, ha estado denunciando esto como básicamente una operación de cambio de régimen estadounidense contra el presidente Maduro, contra el chavismo en Venezuela. Y algunas personas están diciendo que esta amenaza podría convertirse en una invasión militar. Pero al menos por ahora, el número de tropas que estamos viendo no es suficiente para lanzar una invasión militar contra Venezuela.

Porque, por ejemplo, la invasión militar contra Panamá en los años 80 requirió alrededor de 30.000 tropas estadounidenses. Ahora mismo, Estados Unidos solo tiene la mitad de esa cantidad de tropas cerca de Venezuela. Así que va a ser difícil para Estados Unidos hacer una invasión militar con las fuerzas que vemos actualmente. Eso no significa que Estados Unidos no pueda reunir rápidamente más tropas cerca de Venezuela. No podemos descartar la posibilidad de una invasión militar. Pero como está la situación ahora mismo, la gente dice que es muy probable que puedan ocurrir ataques aéreos —ataques de decapitación, lo que significa que Estados Unidos tratará de matar al liderazgo del chavismo—. Esa es una posibilidad real, y eso es lo que muchos de nosotros aquí en Venezuela hemos estado preocupados en semanas recientes. Ese es el contexto del despliegue militar. El argumento de Estados Unidos es que están en una nueva guerra contra las drogas para tratar de proteger al pueblo estadounidense. Todos sabemos que eso es una gran mentira. Porque si Estados Unidos realmente quiere proteger al pueblo estadounidense de las drogas, primero se desharía de los cárteles que operan en Estados Unidos.

Estoy hablando de cárteles de gente blanca, no de cárteles mexicanos o colombianos —la gente que mueve las drogas en Estados Unidos—. Y segundo, deberían hacer programas reales e integrales para tratar de ayudar al pueblo estadounidense atrapado en adicciones a las drogas y tratar de hacer un programa masivo para realmente tratar de sacar al pueblo estadounidense de las drogas.

Esa es la realidad. Y las drogas van a Estados Unidos porque el mercado más grande para las drogas está ahí. Por eso las drogas van a Estados Unidos. Nunca vas a terminar con el negocio del crimen de las drogas yendo a la fuente de la cocaína u otros cultivos que se usan para fabricar drogas.

Pero ese ha sido el argumento de Estados Unidos. Y con ese argumento, ya han matado a 83 personas —civiles— en botes pequeños en el Caribe, generando muchas alarmas en todo el mundo e incluso en Estados Unidos sobre la legalidad de esto. Saben, no puedes matar a alguien solo porque fuiste alertado por un informante de que el bote lleva drogas, porque a menudo hay errores en la inteligencia. Los expertos dicen que con las incautaciones de drogas en el Caribe usando los procedimientos regulares, hay una tasa de error del 25%. [Esto proviene del informe de desempeño del año fiscal 2024 de la Guardia Costera estadounidense.]

Así que lo que estoy tratando de decirles es que quizás de esas 83 almas que han sido asesinadas en el Caribe, si damos por sentado que realmente fueron alertados de que eran botes pequeños que llevaban drogas, al menos 20 de

esas personas podrían haber sido inocentes. La operación es un gran error. Ha sido criticada. Y estoy bastante seguro de que eventualmente será detenida. Y mucha gente va a ser acusada porque es ilegal bajo todas las leyes que quieras considerar.

Y la gente no es solo de Venezuela, sino también de Colombia, Trinidad y Tobago, e incluso de Ecuador. Un sobreviviente de Ecuador ha sido atacado por estos golpes. Así que ese es el panorama de la situación actual que hemos visto en el Caribe. Y hay retórica que viene de Washington sobre atacar supuestas instalaciones de producción de drogas en Venezuela y narcotraficantes, supuestamente, y han acusado al presidente Maduro de ser el jefe de un cártel que es inexistente, que es el Cártel de los Soles.

Crearon este cártel ficticio solo para tratar de asociar al presidente Maduro con ese cártel y justificar ataques contra Venezuela. Pero también lo acusaron de estar vinculado al Tren de Aragua, que es una banda criminal que en realidad no tenía nada que ver, al menos en gran medida, con drogas. Y cuando aumentaron la recompensa por el presidente Maduro en agosto, también lo acusaron de tener vínculos con el cártel mexicano de Sinaloa. Así que acusaron al presidente Maduro de ser peor que Pablo Escobar en Colombia en los años 80. Así que eso es para darles una idea de toda la manipulación. Pero esta es una narrativa usada para apoyar ataques y una operación de cambio de régimen, y estos ataques militares contra Venezuela.

Así que ese es básicamente el contexto de lo que está ocurriendo ahora mismo. Y eso ya ha creado muchas tensiones en la región. El presidente Petro de Colombia ha estado denunciando estos ataques, porque colombianos ya fueron atacados por estos golpes. El presidente Petro ha estado diciendo que no va a permitir el uso de suelo colombiano para ningún ataque militar contra Venezuela. Y el presidente de Brasil ha estado cuestionando y criticando el despliegue estadounidense. Hay un rechazo creciente de esta operación militar estadounidense en el Caribe y las amenazas contra Venezuela.

Hace unas semanas, la CELAC [Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños] tuvo una cumbre, y en su declaración final, la mayoría de los países de la CELAC acordaron que la zona de paz en América Latina, declarada por la CELAC en 2014, necesita ser respetada, que América Latina y el Caribe deben ser considerados una zona de paz. Y no debería haber ataques militares y tensiones militares en la región. Mientras tanto, en Venezuela, no hemos estado sentados aquí esperando que los gringos nos invadan. Nos estamos preparando para lo que sea que los gringos quieran hacer.

Cuando esto comenzó, el presidente Maduro pidió a los venezolanos que se alistaran voluntariamente en la milicia bolivariana. Y la milicia bolivariana en Venezuela no es como las milicias que tienen allá en Indiana o Minnesota, de gente blanca que odia al gobierno federal, disparando y haciendo locuras. La Milicia Bolivariana en Venezuela es parte del ejército. Es una rama adicional del ejército. Y es importante destacar esto porque los medios de comunicación dominantes y las redes sociales han estado difundiendo que el presidente Maduro está regalando armas y armas a todo el mundo. Y eso no es cierto. Antes de ese llamado, la milicia bolivariana ya tenía una gran cantidad de tropas alistadas, cerca de 4,5 millones de personas.

Cuando el presidente Maduro hizo el llamado para alistamiento voluntario, ese número aumentó, según cifras del gobierno, a 3 millones de personas adicionales de la milicia. Así que, según cifras del gobierno, Venezuela debería tener alrededor de 8 millones de personas de la milicia. Quizás el gobierno está exagerando. Si me preguntan, creo que el número real podría estar alrededor de 6 o 6,5 millones de personas, pero ese es un número increíble de todas formas. Y ese número siempre ha asustado al ejército estadounidense porque no muchos países tienen una milicia de ese tamaño.

Y con el alistamiento de nueva gente de la milicia, el gobierno y los militares anunciaron estos ejercicios —ejercicios militares en todo el país en entrenamiento de esta nueva gente de la milicia para combate, entrenamiento en el uso de armas, en atención médica, en situaciones de emergencia, todo el entrenamiento que se necesita para situaciones como esta.

Y eso ha sido hecho por el gobierno y las instituciones de Venezuela de una manera muy responsable, sin crear alarma o sin tener tanques y cosas en la calle por todas partes. Todo el proceso se ha realizado de una manera muy responsable para evitar crear pánico entre la población. De hecho, nos han estado pidiendo que no entremos en pánico y noticias falsas, que sigamos haciendo nuestras cosas regulares sin afectar nuestro trabajo o las actividades productivas que hacemos.

Y cuando el portaaviones Gerald Ford llegó hace unos días al Caribe, Venezuela anunció la continuación del relanzamiento de estos ejercicios militares con 200.000 tropas desplegadas en todo el territorio. Y ese ejercicio militar continúa. Porque la amenaza es inminente, es real.

De hecho, hace unos días, durante las últimas dos o tres semanas, hubo interferencia de GPS en todo Venezuela porque nadie sabe si eso fue creado por el gobierno estadounidense o si fue un mecanismo defensivo usado por los militares de Venezuela para tratar de interferir con las operaciones estadounidenses cerca de nuestras fronteras. Pero de todas formas, esas cosas nos afectan y crean cierta tensión entre los venezolanos porque cuando esas cosas pasan, empiezas a pensar que algo más grande podría ocurrir eventualmente, muy pronto.

La alarma existe aquí, pero no estamos en pánico. Estamos preocupados, pero estamos listos para defender el país. Y el chavismo va a permanecer aquí incluso si Estados Unidos se atreve a lanzar estos llamados ataques de "decapitación" contra el liderazgo chavista. El presidente Maduro y Diosdado Cabello, y todos los líderes de la Revolución Bolivariana son muy importantes, pero la Revolución Bolivariana y el chavismo son más grandes que ellos. Y matar a Maduro y al liderazgo del chavismo no terminará con la Revolución Bolivariana. Y eso es lo que la gente en Estados Unidos debería saber. Quiero decir, el chavismo va a permanecer aquí. Y si Estados Unidos está ahí para atacarnos, haremos lo que podamos para defendernos.

Va a ser difícil porque el ejército estadounidense es el ejército más grande y poderoso que hay. Pero eso no significa que no sea derrotable. De hecho, ha sido derrotado en varios lugares en tiempos recientes. Solo tienen que hablar de Afganistán. Pero también pueden ir a Vietnam. Hay varios momentos en la historia donde la organización del pueblo muestra que el ejército estadounidense puede ser derrotado, y la forma en que operan los militares en Venezuela usa el concepto que usa el pueblo vietnamita, que es la guerra de todo el pueblo. Este es un concepto que fue inicialmente acuñado por Mao en China. Así que si algo malo pasa, si el peor escenario ocurre, haremos lo que podamos para expulsar a los gringos de Venezuela.

Traducción automática de Struggle-La Lucha

Venezuelan's defense

Continued from page 19

here even if the U.S. dares to launch these so-called "decapitation" strikes against Chavista leadership. President Maduro and Diosdado Cabello, and all the leaders of the Bolivarian Revolution are very important, but the Bolivarian Revolution and Chavismo are bigger than them. And killing Maduro and the leadership of Chavismo won't end the Bolivarian Revolution. And that's what people in the U.S. should know. I mean, Chavismo will remain here. And if the U.S. is there to attack us, we will do whatever we can to defend ourselves.

It's going to be hard because the U.S. military is the biggest and most powerful military out there. But that doesn't mean that it's not defeatable. Actually, it has been defeated in several locations in recent times. You just have to talk about Afghanistan. But you can also go to Vietnam. There are several moments in history where the organization of the people shows that the U.S. military can be defeated, and the way the military in Venezuela operates it uses the concept that the Vietnamese people use, which is the war of all people. This is a concept that was initially coined by Mao in China. So if something bad happens, if the worst scenario happens, we will do whatever we can to expel the gringos out of Venezuela. #

Is the U.S. orchestrating protests in Mexico

By Sharon Black

The evidence is clear: Washington is actively attempting to destabilize Mexico. The target is not only the progressive government of President Claudia Sheinbaum but the very sovereignty of the nation, a move that aligns with the escalating threats against Venezuela.

The script is familiar. Corporate media outlets like Fox News and CNN are trumpeting violent protests, branding them as a "Generation Z" revolt. The unrest, sparked by the Nov. 2 murder of the mayor of Uruapan, Michoacán, Mexico, who's been likened to the reactionary Salvadoran President Nayib Bukele, is being cynically directed by right-wing forces. Former Mexican President and Coca-Cola millionaire Vicente Fox is a key player, promoting these demonstrations.

The hidden hand of U.S. imperialism is plain to see. So-called independent media outlet "Animal Politico," which receives direct funding from the U.S. government's National Endowment for Democracy (NED), is amplifying the calls for protest. The NED, along with the Open Society Foundations, the Ford Foundation, and the Google News Initiative, provides its funding, and the U.S. embassy provides training. U.S.-based social media platforms have ratcheted up their algorithms to promote the unrest, mirroring the insidious manipulation of the 2011 Arab Spring.

The protests, with their anti-authority branding, carry a sinister, anti-socialist direction, linking Sheinbaum to Cuba and Venezuela. This is not an organic youth movement; it is a manufactured crisis.

Mexican president Claudia Sheinbaum said, "We agree with freedom of expression and freedom of demonstration if there are young people who have demands, but the issue here is who is promoting the demonstration. ... People should know how this demonstration was organised so that no one is used."

Meanwhile, the U.S. far right is seizing the opportunity to advance its agenda. MAGA figures like Steve Bannon and Alex Jones are labeling Mexico a "narco-terrorist state."

They have magnified the false narrative that the Mexican government of Sheinbaum is about to collapse under the weight of a popular "revolution." The official figure for the Nov. 15 demonstration in Mexico City was 17,000 people. President Claudia Sheinbaum's government approval ratings remain above 70%. Currently, there is no existential risk to her government.

Open threat of U.S. military strikes in Mexico

Donald Trump has seized on the unrest to issue one of the most brazen threats against Mexico in modern U.S. history: unilateral military strikes on Mexican territory.

On Nov. 17, a during an exchange with reporters in the White House, Trump was asked if he would support or launch military ground strikes inside Mexico similar to the lethal maritime strikes against small boats in the Caribbean. Trump answered: "Would I launch strikes in

Japan and U.S. move toward confrontation over Taiwan

Continued from page 13

Japan began long before Germany invaded Poland in 1939. It began with Japan's invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and the full-scale assault on China in 1937. Taiwan, too, was seized by Japan – colonized after the 1895 invasion and kept under imperial rule until 1945.

Taiwan after the Chinese Revolution

Taiwan's modern history is inseparable from the Chinese Revolution. As the People's Liberation Army defeated the reactionary Kuomintang on the mainland, the KMT regime collapsed in rapid retreat. Between late 1948 and 1949 – culminating shortly after the founding of the People's Republic of China on Oct. 1, 1949 – Chiang Kai-shek evacuated roughly 1.5 to 2 million soldiers, officials, and supporters to Taiwan.

Once on the island, the KMT imposed martial law and unleashed the "White Terror," a brutal campaign of repression against workers, students, leftists, and anyone suspected of sympathizing with the mainland revolution. Tens of thousands were imprisoned, thousands were executed, and many simply disappeared into military prisons. The terror lasted for decades, well into the 1980s.

After World War II, Taiwan was returned to China when Japan renounced its colonial claims. But the U.S.-dominated 1951 Treaty of San Francisco – drafted without the participation of either the newly founded People's Republic of China or the Kuomintang authorities on Taiwan – deliberately left Taiwan's legal status unresolved. Washington exploited this manufactured ambiguity to obstruct China's reunification and expand its military foothold in the region.

Washington blocks China's reunification

With the Chinese Revolution victorious on the mainland, Washington moved quickly to prevent the new People's Republic from completing national reunification. In June 1950, President Harry Truman ordered the U.S. Seventh Fleet into the Taiwan Strait, blocking the People's Liberation Army from moving on Taiwan and shielding the defeated Kuomintang regime.

The United States soon signed a mutual defense treaty with the authorities on Taiwan and poured military equipment and advisers onto the island. For two decades – long after the Kuomintang had lost all credibility on the mainland – Washington insisted that this regime represented "Free China" and maneuvered to keep the People's Republic of China out of the United Nations.

This had nothing to do with "defending democracy." It was part of a broader U.S. effort to contain the Chinese Revolution and suppress anti-colonial movements rising across Asia.

A shifting global balance

Today, the world situation has changed dramatically. Both the United States and Japan are facing deep capitalist stagnation – marked by slowing growth, rising prices, and long-term economic decline. These crises are pushing the ruling classes in both countries toward greater militarism abroad.

At the same time, socialist China has emerged as one of the central engines of the global economy. By purchasing-power parity, China is now the world's largest economy, and its industrial and technological advances continue to challenge U.S. domination in region after region.

This is the backdrop for Washington and Tokyo's escalating confrontation with China. For the U.S. and Japan, military expansion is once again being promoted as a way out of capitalist crisis – and that makes the danger to the world far greater.

Washington's own think tanks are already sketching out the opening moves of a new war. The Center for Strategic and International Studies, a major Pentagon-aligned institute, released a detailed scenario in its report The First Battle of the Next War: Wargaming a Chinese Invasion of Taiwan. The study lays out step-by-step plans for U.S. and Japanese military action, treating a catastrophic conflict in the western Pacific as if it were a policy blueprint rather than a global disaster.

Both the United States and Japan are preparing for confrontation, not diplomacy. But war is not inevitable. The struggle of the people – in the U.S., across Asia, and around the world – can stop the drive toward a disastrous conflict with China before it begins. #

to pave the way for war on Venezuela?

Mexico to stop drugs? It's OK with me. Whatever we have to do to stop drugs." Pressed further, Trump pointed to images from Mexico City and said, "I looked at Mexico City over the weekend. There are some big problems over there."

Although Trump did not announce a formal plan, he openly signaled his willingness to violate Mexican sovereignty — and declared he would be "proud" to use U.S. firepower against foreign targets, a phrasing he has previously used when discussing strikes in the region.

These remarks amount to a public green light for military escalation. Coming from a president who has already designated major Mexican cartels as "Foreign Terrorist Organizations," a move meant to provide a legal pretext for the kinds of drone strikes and Special Forces raids the U.S. routinely conducts in Somalia, Yemen, Iraq, and Syria.

Mexico's President Claudia Sheinbaum immediately rejected the threat, stating that U.S. military personnel will not be entering Mexico and that such intervention is "absolutely ruled out." "Mexico's sovereignty is not negotiable," she said at a Nov. 18 press conference.

Who are the real drug traffickers? The CIA.

If Trump were sincere about combating drug trafficking, he would look closer to home — at the CIA.

The CIA's complicity in drug trafficking is a documented fact. In the 1980s, the agency worked with Contra-connected drug dealers in Nicaragua, a connection exposed by journalist Gary Webb's "Dark Alliance" series, which revealed how these networks helped spark the crack cocaine epidemic in Los Angeles.

This pattern repeated in Afghanistan, where the U.S. allied with opium-trafficking warlords and militia allies during the 2001 U.S. war on Afghanistan.

The issue is not about drugs. It is about imperialist control. The issue is about manufacturing consent from the people of the United States who are suffering under an epidemic of drugs, an epidemic that is ironically a by-product of both capitalist profiteering and the resultant despair of its population.

The current orchestrated unrest in Mexico is a dual-purpose operation: to undermine a sovereign government that refuses to bow to Washington and to manufacture public consent for a wider war on the independent nations of the Global South. While Mexico, Venezuela, and Cuba will bear the brunt of this aggression, the U.S. working class will also suffer unless this drive toward war is stopped. #

¿Está Estados Unidos orquestando protestas en México?

Continua de página 24

aumentado sus algoritmos para promover los disturbios, reflejando la manipulación insidiosa de la Primavera Árabe de 2011.

Las protestas, con su marca anti-autoridad, llevan una dirección siniestra y antisocialista, vinculando a Sheinbaum con Cuba y Venezuela. Este no es un movimiento juvenil orgánico; es una crisis fabricada.

La presidenta mexicana Claudia Sheinbaum dijo: "Estamos de acuerdo con la libertad de expresión y la libertad de manifestación si hay jóvenes que tienen demandas, pero el tema aquí es quién está promoviendo la manifestación. … La gente debería saber cómo se organizó esta manifestación para que nadie sea utilizado".

Mientras tanto, la extrema derecha estadounidense está aprovechando la oportunidad para avanzar su agenda. Figuras MAGA como Steve Bannon y Alex Jones están etiquetando a México como un "estado narcoterrorista".

Han magnificado la falsa narrativa de que el gobierno mexicano de Sheinbaum está a punto de colapsar bajo el peso de una "revolución" popular. La cifra oficial para la manifestación del 15 de noviembre en la Ciudad de México fue de 17.000 personas. Los índices de aprobación del gobierno de la presidenta Claudia Sheinbaum permanecen por encima del 70%. Actualmente, no hay un riesgo existencial para su gobierno.

Trump escala: amenaza abierta de ataques militares estadounidenses en México

Donald Trump ha aprovechado los disturbios para emitir una de las amenazas más descaradas contra México en la historia moderna de Estados Unidos: ataques militares unilaterales en territorio mexicano.

El 17 de noviembre, durante un intercambio con reporteros en la Casa Blanca, se le preguntó a Trump si apoyaría o lanzaría ataques militares terrestres dentro de México similares a los ataques marítimos letales contra botes pequeños en el Caribe.

Trump respondió: "¿Lanzaría ataques en México para detener las drogas? Está bien para mí. Lo que tengamos que hacer para detener las drogas". Presionado más, Trump señaló imágenes de la Ciudad de México y dijo: "Miré la Ciudad de México durante el fin de semana. Hay algunos grandes problemas allá".

Aunque Trump no anunció un plan formal, señaló abiertamente su disposición a violar la soberanía mexicana y declaró que estaría "orgulloso" de usar el poder de fuego estadounidense contra objetivos extranjeros, una frase que ha usado previamente al discutir ataques en la región.

Estas declaraciones equivalen a una luz verde pública para la escalada militar. Vienen de un presidente que ya ha designado a los principales cárteles mexicanos como "Organizaciones Terroristas Extranjeras", un movimiento destinado a proporcionar un pretexto legal para el tipo de ataques con drones e incursiones de Fuerzas Especiales que Estados Unidos realiza rutinariamente en Somalia, Yemen, Irak y Siria.

La presidenta de México, Claudia Sheinbaum, rechazó inmediatamente la amenaza, afirmando que el personal militar estadounidense no entrará a México y que tal intervención está "absolutamente descartada".

"La soberanía de México no es negociable", dijo en una conferencia de prensa del 18 de noviembre.

¿Quiénes son los verdaderos narcotraficantes? La CIA.

Si Trump fuera sincero sobre combatir el narcotráfico, miraría más cerca de casa, a la CIA.

La complicidad de la CIA en el narcotráfico es un hecho documentado. En los años 80, la agencia trabajó con narcotraficantes conectados con los Contras en Nicaragua, una conexión expuesta por la serie "Dark Alliance" del periodista Gary Webb, que reveló cómo estas redes ayudaron a desencadenar la epidemia de crack en Los Ángeles.

Este patrón se repitió en Afganistán, donde Estados Unidos se alió con señores de la guerra traficantes de opio y aliados de milicias durante la guerra estadounidense de 2001 en Afganistán.

El tema no es sobre las drogas. Es sobre el control imperialista. El tema es sobre fabricar el consentimiento del pueblo de Estados Unidos que está sufriendo bajo una epidemia de drogas, una epidemia que irónicamente es un subproducto tanto del lucro capitalista como de la desesperación resultante de su población.

Los actuales disturbios orquestados en México son una operación de doble propósito: socavar a un gobierno soberano que se niega a inclinarse ante Washington y fabricar el consentimiento público para una guerra más amplia contra las naciones independientes del Sur Global. Mientras México, Venezuela y Cuba cargarán con el peso de esta agresión, la clase trabajadora estadounidense también sufrirá a menos que se detenga este impulso hacia la guerra.

Traducción automática de Struggle-La Lucha

La Revolución Bolivariana es más grande que Maduro:
Los venezolanos listos para defender su país

Por Jesús Rodríguez-Espinoza

La siguiente charla de Jesús Rodríguez-Espinoza fue presentada en el foro "No a la Guerra contra Venezuela" realizado en Baltimore el 22 de noviembre. Rodríguez-Espinoza es ex Cónsul General de Venezuela en Chicago y experimentado analista de relaciones internacionales y política venezolana. Fue editor fundador de Aporrea.org y es fundador del reconocido medio antiimperialista Orinoco Tribune.

El foro fue patrocinado por Peoples Power Assembly, Struggle for Socialism Party, CPUSA Baltimore Club, Friends of Latin America, Casa Baltimore Limay, ILPS Baltimore / DM, Baltimore Peace Action, Baltimore Vets for Peace y Black Alliance for Peace, Baltimore. El foro puede verse en el canal de YouTube de Struggle - La Lucha.

Jesús Rodríguez-Espinoza habla a una audiencia en Baltimore sobre la escalada de agresión estadounidense contra Venezuela y América Latina. Foto SLL

Gracias por la invitación, camaradas. Y gracias por organizar estos eventos, especialmente bajo las circunstancias actuales, bajo el actual despliegue militar estadounidense sin precedentes en la región. Así que primero quiero tratar de explicar la manera en que veo el contexto geopolítico alrededor de esta situación.

Básicamente, me recuerda las primeras cosas que dijo el presidente Trump cuando inició su nuevo mandato. Y recuerdo que cuando escuché que estaba hablando de tener control de Groenlandia, o anexar Canadá, o cambiar el nombre del Golfo de México al Golfo de América, o retomar el Canal de Panamá, inicialmente pensé que esas eran declaraciones locas, propias de la manera en que se comporta Donald Trump.

Pero ahora lo veo diferente, especialmente después de leer y escuchar a analistas, expertos y pensadores hablando sobre cómo Estados Unidos ha estado dándose cuenta de que hay un cambio en las correlaciones de fuerzas a nivel mundial. Y Estados Unidos simplemente está tratando de asegurar el lugar —el área que considera su dominio, su patio trasero, su vecindario, como sea que quieran llamarlo—. Pero básicamente eso es lo que ha estado ocurriendo.

Y este despliegue militar en el Caribe y esta amenaza de invasión militar o ataques contra Venezuela son simplemente una expresión de ese enfoque, ese nuevo enfoque de política exterior que viene de Estados Unidos. Y no es porque el presidente Trump sea extremadamente brillante ni nada por el estilo. Esos planes han sido diseñados durante años por la oligarquía en Estados Unidos, por quienes controlan a Estados Unidos, que son las corporaciones. Así que básicamente quieren asegurar el acceso a recursos naturales y a mercados en esta parte del mundo. Porque Rusia y China —y otros países, como India o Turquía o Sudáfrica— han estado disputando la preeminencia y la supremacía que Estados Unidos ha ejercido durante varias décadas, especialmente después de la caída de la Unión Soviética en los años 90.

Ese es el contexto general de esta situación que nos está afectando. Y bajándolo a la realidad nos lleva a lo que acabo de mencionar, que son los recursos naturales. Dentro de este escenario global, Estados Unidos necesita asegurar recursos naturales de la región, y Venezuela es uno de esos países en la región que resulta tener la reserva de petróleo más grande del mundo. Así que es estratégico para un país como Estados Unidos.

Ese es básicamente el contexto de lo que está ocurriendo, y le agrego a ese contexto el elemento del "mal ejemplo" —entre comillas— de Venezuela. Porque Venezuela representa un país que no se somete a los dictados estadounidenses, no obedece lo que Washington

Continua a página 23

¿Está Estados Unidos orquestando protestas en México para allanar el camino a la guerra contra Venezuela?

Por Sharon Black

La evidencia es clara: Washington está intentando activamente desestabilizar a México. El objetivo no es solo el gobierno progresista de la presidenta Claudia Sheinbaum, sino la soberanía misma de la nación, un movimiento que se alinea con las crecientes amenazas contra Venezuela.

El guion es familiar. Medios corporativos como Fox News y CNN están pregonando protestas violentas, catalogándolas como una revuelta de la "Generación Z". Los disturbios, provocados por el asesinato el 2 de noviembre del alcalde de Uruapan, Michoacán, México, quien ha sido comparado con el presidente reaccionario salvadoreño Nayib Bukele, están siendo dirigidos cínicamente por fuerzas de derecha. El ex presidente mexicano y millonario de Coca-Cola, Vicente Fox, es un actor clave, promoviendo estas manifestaciones.

La mano oculta del imperialismo estadounidense es evidente. El llamado medio independiente "Animal Político", que recibe financiamiento directo del National Endowment for Democracy (NED) del gobierno estadounidense, está amplificando los llamados a protestar. El NED, junto con las Open Society Foundations, la Fundación Ford y la Google News Initiative, proporciona su financiamiento, y la embajada estadounidense proporciona capacitación. Las plataformas de redes sociales con sede en Estados Unidos han

Continua a página 15

Un manifestante en Guadalajara ondea una bandera de la popular serie de manga One Piece. En meses recientes, los algoritmos de redes sociales y los medios corporativos han impulsado imágenes de esta bandera en protestas alrededor del mundo, presentándola como un símbolo de rebelión "anticorrupción" de la Generación Z mientras dejan de lado imágenes arraigadas en políticas progresistas claras.

STRUGGLE ★ LA LUCHA
for Socialism | por el Socialismo
Vol. 8, No. 22 Dec. 1, 2025 Vol. 8, Núm. 22 1 de diciembre 2025